Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 1–?? (2013) Printed 26 March 2014 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

Theory of stellar convection: Removing the Mixing-Length Parameter

S. Pasetto [1⋆], C. Chiosi [2⋆] M. Cropper [1⋆], and E. K. Grebel [3⋆]
[1] *University College London, Department of Space & Climate Physics, Mullard Space Science Laboratory, Holmbury St. Mary, Dorking Surrey, United Kingdom*
[2] *Department of Physics & Astronomy, "Galileo Galilei", University of Padua, Padova, Italy*
[3] *Astronomisches Rechen-Institut, Zentrum für Astronomie der Universität Heidelberg, Mönchhofstr. 12-14, 69120, Heidelberg, Germany*

arXiv:1403.6122v1 [astro-ph.SR] 24 Mar 2014

Submitted to MNRAS March 2014

ABSTRACT
Stellar convection is customarily described by Mixing-Length Theory, which makes use of the mixing-length scale to express the convective flux, velocity, and temperature gradients of the convective elements and stellar medium. The mixing-length scale is taken to be proportional to the local pressure scale height, and the proportionality factor (the mixing-length parameter) must be determined by comparing the stellar models to some calibrator, usually the Sun. No strong arguments exist to suggest that the mixing-length parameter is the same in all stars and at all evolutionary phases. Because of this, all stellar models in literature are hampered by this basic uncertainty. The aim of this study is to present a new theory of stellar convection that does not require the mixing length parameter. We present a self-consistent analytical formulation of stellar convection that determines the properties of stellar convection as a function of the physical behaviour of the convective elements themselves and the surrounding medium. This new theory is formulated starting from a conventional solution of the Navier-Stokes/Euler equations, i.e. the Bernoulli equation for a perfect fluid, but expressed in a non-inertial reference frame co-moving with the convective elements. In our formalism the motion of stellar convective cells inside convective-unstable layers is fully determined by a new system of equations for convection in a non-local and time dependent formalism. We obtain an analytical, non-local, time-dependent solution for the convective energy transport that does not depend on any free parameter. The predictions of the new theory are compared with those from the standard mixing-length paradigm for the most accurate calibrator, the Sun, with very satisfactory results.

Key words: stellar structure – theory of convection – mixing-length theory

1 INTRODUCTION

In stellar interiors convection plays an important role: together with radiation and conduction, it transports energy throughout a star, and it chemically homogenizes the regions affected by convective instability. Therefore convection significantly affects the structures and evolutionary histories of stars. For example, the centre of main sequence stars slightly more massive than the Sun and above is dominated by convective transport of energy. In stars less massive than about 0.3 $M_{\odot}$ the whole structure becomes fully convective. The outer layers of stars of any mass are convective toward the surface. Very extended convective envelopes exist in red-giant-branch (RGB) and asymptotic-giant-branch (AGB) stars. Pre-main sequence stars are fully convective along the Hayashi-line. Finally convection is present in the pre-supernova stages of type I and II supernovae, and even during the collapse phase of type II supernovae (e.g., Kippenhahn et al. 2013; Maeder 2009; Weiss et al. 2004). In most cases, convection in the cores and inner shells does not pose serious difficulties to our understanding of the structure of the stars because the large thermal capacity of convective elements results in the degree of "super-adiabaticity" being so small that for any practical purpose the temperature gradient of the medium in presence of convection

⋆ E-mail: s.pasetto@ucl.ac.uk (SP); cesare.chiosi@unipd.it (CC); m.cropper@ucl.ac.uk (MC); grebel@ari.uni-heidelberg.de (EG)

© 2013 RAS

can be set equal to the adiabatic value, unless evaluations of the velocities and distances traveled by convective elements are required, e.g. in presence of convective overshooting (see for instance the early studies by Maeder 1975a,b; Bressan et al. 1981). Describing convection in the outer layers of a star is by far more difficult and uncertain. Convective elements in this region have low thermal capacity, so that the super-adiabatic approximation can no longer be applied, and the temperature gradient of the elements and surrounding medium must be determined separately to exactly know the amount of energy carried by convection and radiation (e.g., Kippenhahn et al. 2013; Weiss et al. 2004).

A suitable description of convection is therefore essential to determine stellar structure. The universally adopted solution is the Mixing-Length Theory (MLT) of convection, a simplified analytical formulation of the problem. Unfortunately, a more satisfactory analytical treatment of stellar convection is still missing and open to debate (e.g., Canuto 2011). The MLT stands on the works of Biermann (1951) and Böhm-Vitense (1958) which are based on earlier works on the concept of convective motion by Prandtl (1925). In this standard approach, the motion of convective elements is related to the mean-free-path l_m that a generic element is *supposed* to travel at any given depth inside the convectively unstable regions of a star (e.g., Kippenhahn & Weigert 1994, Chapter 7). The mean free path l_m is assumed to be proportional to the natural distance scale h_P given by the pressure stratification of the star. The proportionality factor is however poorly known and constrained. The mixing-length (ML) parameter Λ_m, defined by $l_m \equiv \Lambda_m h_P$, must be empirically determined. Nevertheless, the knowledge of this parameter is of paramount importance in correctly determining the convective energy transport, and hence the radius and effective temperature of a star. This critical situation explains the many versions of convection theory that can be found when investigated in different regions and evolutionary phases of a star such as the overshooting from core or envelopes zones (e.g., Deng & Xiong 2008; Claret 2007; Bressan et al. 1981), the helium semi-convection in low and intermediate mass stars $m < 5M_\odot$ (e.g., Bressan et al. 1993; Castellani et al. 1985), the time-dependent convection in the carbon deflagration process in Type I supernovae (e.g., Nomoto et al. 1976), and the studies on the efficiency of convective overshooting (e.g., Bressan et al. 2013), to mention just a few.

Looking at the classical formulation of the MLT presented in any textbook, see for instance Hofmeister et al. (1964), Cox & Giuli (1968) and their modern versions (Kippenhahn et al. 2013; Weiss et al. 2004, respectively), we note the MLT reduces to the energy conservation principle supplemented by an estimate of the mean velocity of convective elements. In a convective region the total energy flux (φ) is the sum of the convective flux ($\varphi_{\rm cnv}$) and the radiative flux ($\varphi_{\rm rad}$); the total flux is set proportional to a fictitious radiative gradient $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ [1] (which is always known once the total flux coming from inside is assigned, typical case of stellar interiors); the true radiative flux $\varphi_{\rm rad}$ is proportional to the real gradient of the medium ∇; and the convective flux $\varphi_{\rm con}$ is proportional to the difference between the gradient of the convective elements and the gradient of the medium $(\nabla_e - \nabla)$. By construction, the convective flux is also proportional to the mass of an ideal convective element, i.e., the amount of matter crossing the unit area per unit time with the mean velocity of convective elements. These elements may have any shape, mass, velocity and lifetime, and may travel different distances before dissolving into the the surrounding medium, releasing their energy excess and inducing mixing in the fluid. However all this ample variety of possibilities is simplified to an ideal element of averaged dimensions, lifetime, mean velocity and distance travelled before dissolving: the so-called mixing length l_m (and associated mixing length parameter Λ_m). As far the velocity is concerned, this is estimated from the work done by the buoyancy force over the distance l_m, a fraction of which is supposed to go into kinetic energy of the convective elements. Since in this problem the number of unknowns exceed the number of equations (flux conservation and velocity), two more suitable relations are usually added. These are firstly the ratio between the excess of energy in the bubble just before dissolving, to the energy radiated away (lost) during the lifetime, and secondly the excess rate of energy generation minus the excess rate of energy loss by radiation in the element relative to the surroundings (all functions of ∇, ∇_e and $\nabla_{\rm ad}$, see e.g., Cox & Giuli (1968)). Now the number of unknowns, i.e. F_{rad}, F_{con}, ∇, ∇_e, is equal to the number of equations and the problem can be solved once l_m and/or Λ_m are assigned. *In this way that the complex fluid-dynamic situation is reduced to an estimate of the mean element velocity simply derived from the sole buoyancy force, neglecting other fluid-dynamic forces that can shape the motion of convective elements as function of time and surrounding medium.*

We present here a new description of stellar convection that provides a simple and yet dynamically complete fully analytical integration of the hydrodynamic equations, matching the existing literature results based on the classical MLT, but without making use of any mixing-length parameter Λ_m.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we formulate the problem within the mathematical framework we intend to adopt. In Section 3 we define the concept of a scalar field of the velocity potential for expanding/contracting convective elements. In Section 4 we formulate the equation of motion for a convective element as seen by a non-inertial frame of reference co-moving with it, and present two lemmas that are functional to our aims. In Section 5 we solve the equation of motion of a convective element expressed in the co-moving frame of reference. In Section 6 we express the acceleration in the non-inertial frame. In Section 7 we present the predictions of our theory. First, we formulate the basic equations of stellar convection showing that the mixing length parameter is no longer required. Then we apply the new formalism to the case of the Sun. Finally in Section 8 we present some concluding remarks highlighting the novelty and the power of the new theory.

[1] Throughout the paper, we will introduce several logarithmic temperature gradients with respect to pressure $\frac{d\log T}{d\log P}$, shortly indicated as ∇. Each of these gradients is also identified by a subscript such as ∇_e, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$, $\nabla_{\rm ad}$, $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ depending of the circumstances. Finally, the symbol ∇ with no subscript is reserved for the ambient temperature gradient with respect to pressure across a star.

2 FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Inside a convective unstable layer, upward (downward) displacements of convective cells continually occur. The upwardly displaced elements are hotter and lighter than their surroundings, at the same pressure, so that heat exchange results in energy release to the surrounding interstellar medium. For downward displacements the result is the opposite: convective cells sink when they have lower temperatures than their surroundings, and are heated on some length scale. A mathematical formalism for this process is presented in Section 7.1. Here we focus on the motion of single a convective element.

Our starting point is represented by the classical solution of the Navier-Stokes equations for an incompressible perfect fluid where no electromagnetic forces are taken into account (e.g., Chandrasekhar 1961). We approach the mechanics of the convection by approximating the stellar fluid to a perfect fluid, i.e. a fluid of density ρ in which a suitable equation of state (EoS) links density $\rho = \rho(P,T,\mu)$ with pressure $P = P(\boldsymbol{x};t)$, temperature $T = T(\boldsymbol{x};t)$ and molecular weight $\mu = \mu(\boldsymbol{x};t)$ at a given instant t and position $\boldsymbol{x}$ inside a star (see also footnote 3). Perfect fluids are intrinsically unstable and turbulent, therefore the higher the Reynolds numbers characterizing the fluid the better the above approximation holds. It is well known that in stellar interiors where turbulence prevails over viscosity in the Navier-Stokes equations (e.g., Chandrasekhar 1961), the inertial term $\langle \rho\boldsymbol{v}_0, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle$ dominates over the viscous one, $-\eta\underline{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{v}_0$, where $\boldsymbol{v}_0$ is the stellar fluid velocity, η the viscosity coefficient, $\langle ..., ...\rangle$ the standard inner-product between two generic vectors, and $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ and $\underline{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ the gradient and Laplacian operators, respectively, for an inertial reference system of coordinate $S_0(O,\boldsymbol{x})$ centred in O at the centre of the star with direction vector $\boldsymbol{x}$. Then, if in the equation of motion (EoM) for the stellar plasma we neglect the contribution **of** the magnetic field $\boldsymbol{B}$, i.e. the term $\frac{\boldsymbol{j}}{c}\times\boldsymbol{B}$ where $\boldsymbol{j} = \rho\boldsymbol{v}_0$ is the charge-current-density (and ... × ... is the cross-product between two generic vectors) the corresponding Euler's equation, $\frac{\partial\rho\boldsymbol{v}_0}{\partial t} + \langle\nabla, \boldsymbol{P} + \rho\boldsymbol{v}_0\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle - \rho\sum\limits_i n_i\boldsymbol{F}_i = 0$, together with the continuity equation, $\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} + \langle\nabla, \rho\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle = 0$ and accounting for the relation $\langle\nabla, \rho\boldsymbol{v}_0\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle = \boldsymbol{v}_0\rho\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{v}_0 + \rho\boldsymbol{v}_0\cdot\nabla\boldsymbol{v}_0$, reads:

$$\rho\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{v}_0}{\partial t} + \langle\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}, \boldsymbol{P}\rangle + \langle\rho\boldsymbol{v}_0, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle - \sum_i n_i\boldsymbol{F}_i = 0. \quad (1)$$

In Eq.(1), $\boldsymbol{P}$ is the pressure tensor, $\boldsymbol{F}$ the force acting on every particle of the fluid, n_i the number density of every type of fluid particle (with the above assumption that no electric field $\boldsymbol{E}$ enters the plasma EoM). This is a partial differential equation (PDE) where the quantities involved, say Q, are functions of time t and position $\boldsymbol{x}$, $Q = Q(\boldsymbol{x};t)$ in the given inertial reference frame $S_0(O,\boldsymbol{x})$. Hereafter, we omit writing this dependence explicitly to simplify the notation (unless specified otherwise for the sake of better understanding). Stellar interiors are well represented by a perfect fluid in local thermodynamical equilibrium (LTE), i.e. each elemental component, n_i of the fluid is isotropic, homogeneous, in mechanical equilibrium and obeying the conditions of detailed balance with any other component n_j. Therefore, we can then simplify the pressure tensor to a scalar $\langle\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}, \boldsymbol{P}\rangle = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P$, and because the force acting on the fluid particle is non-diffusive, i.e. in our case the gravity $\boldsymbol{F_i} = m_i\boldsymbol{g}$ on the particles of the i-th species, we assume that $\sum\limits_i n_i\boldsymbol{F_i} = \sum\limits_i m_i n_i\boldsymbol{g} = \left(\sum\limits_i m_i n_i\right)\boldsymbol{g} = \rho\boldsymbol{g}$. All this further simplifies Eq. (1) to:

$$\rho\frac{\partial\boldsymbol{v}_0}{\partial t} + \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P + \langle\rho\boldsymbol{v}_0, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle - \rho\boldsymbol{g} = 0. \quad (2)$$

We proceed further with an additional simplification by assuming that the stellar fluid is incompressible and irrotational on large distance scales. The concept of a large distance scale for incompressibility and irrotationality is defined here from a heuristic point of view: This length should be large enough to contain a significant number of convective elements so that a statistical formulation is possible when describing the mean convective flux of energy (see below), but small enough so that the distance travelled by the convective element is short compared to the typical distance over which significant gradients in temperature, density, pressure etc. can develop (i.e. those gradients are locally small). These assumptions stand at the basis of every stellar model integration in the literature, and are fully compatible with making use of the simple concept of a potential flow (e.g., Landau & Lifshitz 1959, Chapter 1): $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\times\boldsymbol{v}_0 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \exists\Phi_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} \mid \boldsymbol{v}_0 = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}$ with $\Phi_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}$ the velocity potential. In particular, with the help of the vector relation $\langle\boldsymbol{v}_0, \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\langle\boldsymbol{v}_0, \boldsymbol{v}_0\rangle - \boldsymbol{v}_0\times(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\times\boldsymbol{v}_0)$ and remembering that the curl of a gradient is null, $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\times\boldsymbol{v}_0 = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\times\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = 0$, we are able to write Eq. (2) as $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\left(\frac{\partial\Phi_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}}{\partial t} + \frac{P}{\rho} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{v}_0\|^2}{2} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\right) = 0$ where the relation between gravitational force and gravitational potential $\boldsymbol{g} = -\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}$ has been adopted. The symbol $\|...\|$ indicates the standard Euclidian norm of a generic vector. Finally, the integration of the previous equation leads to the Bernoulli's equation in an inertial reference system S_0 centred at the centre of the star. With the formalism developed here:

$$\frac{\partial\Phi_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}}{\partial t} + \frac{P}{\rho} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{v}_0\|^2}{2} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}} = f(t). \quad (3)$$

This is one of the basic equations describing the stellar plasma in which convection is at work. A more complete treatment would include diffusion and turbulence. However, as the main goal here is to derive the mechanics of convection from simple principles, the present approach is adequate for our aims. Diffusion and turbulence can eventually be included using the same formalism in a future study. In the context of thermal convection, it is worth recalling that the Boussinesq (Spiegel & Veronis 1960) and anelastic (Gough 1969) approximations would be valuable alternatives worth being investigated. Nevertheless, for the aims of this study the potential flow approximation turns out to be fully satisfactory at an extremely high degree of precision as our numerical investigation in Section 7.3 will confirm.

After these preliminary remarks, we are now in the position to state the queries that we intend to address as follows: the main target of stellar convection is to find a solution of Eq.(3) linking the physical quantities characterizing the stellar interiors such as pressure, density, temperature, velocities etc. and the mechanics governing the motion of the convective elements as functions of the fundamental temperature



Figure 1. Schematic representation of the quantities involved in the two reference systems introduced in the text. In red is an example of an expanding convective element. The reference frame S_0 is fixed at the centre of the star (supposed to be at rest or in translational motion), and the frame S_1 is not inertial and is located with the convective element. The geometry employed is completely general and derived from a simplified version of Fig. 1 of Pasetto & Chiosi (2009).

gradients with respect to pressure, i.e. the radiative gradient $\nabla_{\rm rad}$, the adiabatic gradient $\nabla_{\rm ad}$, the local gradient of the star $\nabla \equiv \left|\frac{d\ln T}{d\ln P}\right|$, the convective element gradient ∇_e and the molecular weight gradient $\nabla_\mu \equiv \left|\frac{d\ln \mu}{d\ln P}\right|$.

The task is difficult because of the large number of variables involved to describe the physics of the convective element and of the stellar interiors, both of which poorly known. Mathematically, the problem translates into a system of Algebraic-Differential Equation (ADE). In the MLT the solution of this ADE is simplified to an algebraic system of equations by introducing a statistical description of the motion, size, lifetime etc. of the convective elements. In this way, the complicated pattern of possible convective elements is reduced to a mean element whose dimensions and path are simply supposed to be $l_m = \Lambda_m h_P$, where Λ_m is a parameter to be fixed by comparing real stars (the Sun) to stellar models. Once Λ_m is calibrated is this way, it is assumed to be the same for all stars of any mass, chemical composition, and evolutionary stage. This is indeed a strong assumption.

In what follows we propose and formulate an alternative approach to this theory and apply it to recover well-established results of the theory of stellar structure and observational properties of our best calibrator, the Sun, but without making use of any adjustable parameter.

The approach is based on the addition of an equation for the motion of the convective elements to the classical system of algebraic equations for the convective transport energy. The whole system of algebraic/differential equations is solved by coupling the evolution of the generalized coordinates (i.e., independents or Lagrangian coordinates) of the radius and position of a convective element. This result is achieved by means of a series of theorems, corollaries and lemmas that analyse the different physical and mathematical aspects of the problem to make progress to the final result.

We will develop the theory in the non-inertial reference frame S_1 co-moving with the convective element instead of the more natural frame S_0 co-moving with the star (Fig. 1). In view of the subsequent discussion, it is worth recalling that the flow past a sphere is indeed a well-studied topic of fluid dynamics. The degrees of freedom of this problem are the bubble radius and the distance of the bubble center from the origin of S_0. With each degree of freedom, there is an independent Lagrangian variable associated, e.g. see Tuteja et al. (2010, and references therein for a recent review and discussion of this issue.) The corresponding Lagrangian equations allow us to derive the acceleration term in which the properties of the convection element are related to the depth inside the star but fail to achieve the desired coupling of the generalized coordinates. The reason is that to compute the kinetic term of the energy we would have to evaluate the integral $T = \frac{1}{2}\rho \int \|\boldsymbol{v}_0\|\, d^3\boldsymbol{x}$ which turns out to diverge. The resulting Lagrange equations reduce to a system of decoupled equations instead of retaining the desired coupling between the generalized coordinates as we will show in the next sections. To cope with this drawback of the Lagrangian formulation in S_0 (lack of the desired coupling among the Lagrangian variables) we are forced to cast the problem in the non inertial system S_1 in analogy to what was done by Pasetto & Chiosi (2009, their section 3.1) and used later by Pasetto et al. (2012, their Eq.(7)), which represent our starting points. We will return to these considerations in greater detail on Section 8.

Before starting our analysis, it might be wise to call attention on a formal aspect of the mathematical notation we have adopted in order to avoid possible misunderstanding of the real meaning of some analytical work. For some quantities Q function of time or space or both, $Q(\mathbf{x};t)$, we look at their asymptotic behaviour by formally taking the limits

$$Q^\infty \equiv \lim_{\substack{\boldsymbol{x}\to\boldsymbol{x}^\infty \\ t\to\infty}} Q\left(\boldsymbol{x};t\right) = Q\left(\boldsymbol{x}^\infty;\infty\right).$$

This does not mean that we are taking temporal intervals infinitely long, rather that we are considering time long enough so that the asymptotic trend of the quantity Q is reached but still short enough so that the physical properties of the whole system have not changed significantly such as that the star still exists. In analogy, with the notation $\boldsymbol{x}^\infty$ we refer to a location far away from the system considered (e.g. the convective element in consideration) but at a given location $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}^\infty$ that is still *inside* the star, i.e. where $\rho = \rho\left(\boldsymbol{x}^\infty\right) \neq 0$, $T = T\left(\boldsymbol{x}^\infty\right) \neq 0$ etc.

3 VELOCITY-POTENTIAL SCALAR-FIELD FOR EXPANDING/CONTRACTING CONVECTIVE ELEMENTS

The formalism we will develop refers to stars in hydrostatic equilibrium under the effect of their own gravity[2] which applies to the vast majority. We limit ourselves to consider

[2] It has long been known that the very external regions of some types of stars, e.g. pulsating stars, may deviate from rigorous hydrostatic equilibrium. Furthermore, some stars may experience evolutionary phases far from hydrostatic equilibrium, e.g. the collapsing core of massive stars or the accretion phase of proto-stars. In both cases convection may set in. Although these situations

the onset of convection either in central cores, intermediate shells and external envelopes in the same conditions usually described by the classical MLT.

In addition to the natural inertial reference frame S_0 whose origin is fixed at the centre of the star (at rest by definition), we now introduce a non-inertial reference frame co-moving with a generic convective element. The new system is named S_1: $(O', \boldsymbol{\xi})$, origin and position vector respectively, to distinguish it from the inertial reference frame S_0. Even though at first glance, this approach may look awkward, because the most intuitive way of thinking about the motion of a body (in our case a convective element) is the translational motion with respect to the static observer, we show that this way of thinking yields the desired mathematical expression for the EoM of the convective element and eventually allows us to eliminate the mixing length parameter.

Assuming spherical symmetry, in S_0 we define the equation of a generic convective element of radius r_e by means of the time dependent relation $\|\boldsymbol{r}\| - r_e(t) = 0$ because the element is expected to expand/contract and rise/sink during its lifetime evolution, and where we indicated with $\|\boldsymbol{r}\| = \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\|$ the radius vector of the element centred on $\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$ at the instant $t = \hat{t}$. This is shown in Fig.1 where the relation between the position vector in S_0 and S_1 is shown.

The determination of the velocity-potential defined in Section 1, i.e. $\Phi^I_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}$ (in which the Roman Numeral I is used to distinguish it from a second velocity potential that we are going to introduce shortly with apex II) which satisfies the Laplace equation $\Delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi^I_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = 0$ in S_0 where the element is at rest in $\boldsymbol{x}_O$, is a generalization of results described in classical textbooks (e.g. Landau & Lifshitz 1966) that leads to the velocity-potential $\Phi^I_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = -\frac{\dot{r}_e r_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{r}\|}$, and the potential velocity $\boldsymbol{v}^I_0 = v_r\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r = \frac{\partial\Phi^I_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}}{\partial r}\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r = \frac{\partial}{\partial r}\left(-\frac{\dot{r}_e r_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{r}\|}\right)\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r = \frac{\dot{r}_e r_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{r}\|^2}\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r$ (the dot indicates the time derivative and $\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r$ is the normal radial vector of a polar coordinate chart centred on $\boldsymbol{x}_O$). The boundary conditions for Dirichlet's problem are (i) far away from the convective element $\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{r}\|\to\infty}\boldsymbol{v}^I_0 = 0$, (ii) the kinematic-boundary-conditions at the surface of the sphere require that the surrounding plasma cannot flow through it, i.e. the velocity has to be purely tangential so that velocity component locally perpendicular to the surface must be zero $\langle \boldsymbol{v}^I_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r\rangle = 0$. When the convective element is moving with velocity $\boldsymbol{v}$ in S_0, the kinematic boundary condition is replaced by the relative velocity between the fluid and the element in motion throughout the stellar plasma $\langle \boldsymbol{v}_0 - \boldsymbol{v}, \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r\rangle = 0$ at $\|\boldsymbol{r}\| = r_e$ to get the classical results for the potential flow, i.e. $\Phi^{II}_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{r_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{r}\|^2}\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r\rangle$ (to distinguish it from $\Phi^I_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}$) with velocity given by $\boldsymbol{v}^{II}_0 = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi^{II}_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = \frac{r_e^3}{2\|\boldsymbol{r}\|^3}\left(3\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r\rangle\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_r - \boldsymbol{v}\right)$ (e.g., Landau & Lifshitz 1966).

We move now our point of view to the non-inertial reference system S_1 co-moving with the convective element and with its axes always aligned with S_0:, i.e. $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{x}_{O'} + \boldsymbol{\xi}$ to get $\Phi'^{II}_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = -\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\right)$ for the potential flow past the convective element, where ξ_e is the radius of the convective element. This is obtained by simply superimposing a translational potential vector, say $\Phi^t_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = -\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle$ to the classical potential vector of the flow past a sphere in S_0. Φ' indicates the potential flow passing the sphere at rest in S_1 (centred in O' located at $\boldsymbol{x}_{O'} = \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}(t)$ in S_0) and with a radius vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}(t) = \boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}(t)$. Now the fluid potential velocity is $\boldsymbol{v'}^{II}_0 = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi'^{II}_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} = \frac{\xi_e^3}{2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\left(3\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle\hat{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{v}\right) - \boldsymbol{v}$ with the desired boundary condition $\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty}\boldsymbol{v'}^{II}_0 = \boldsymbol{v}^\infty = -\boldsymbol{v}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$, the direction of the vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, given by $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}$. Moreover, thanks to the linear character of the Laplace equation $\underline{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi^{\rm tot} = \underline{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\sum_i\Phi^i = \sum_i\underline{\Delta}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\Phi^i = 0$ for any assigned scalar potential Φ, we lump together the potential flows $\Phi'^I_{\boldsymbol{v}_0} + \Phi'^{II}_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}$ for moving and contracting/expanding elements in order to obtain in S_1 the total potential flow outside the element surface as:

$$\Phi' = -\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\right) - \frac{\dot{\xi}_e\xi_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}, \tag{4}$$

where $\Phi' \equiv \Phi'^{\rm tot}_{\boldsymbol{v}_0}$ for the sake of simplicity. The corresponding velocity in S_1 is obtained again as before by computing the gradient $\boldsymbol{v'}_0 \equiv \boldsymbol{v'}^{\rm tot}_0 = \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\xi}}\Phi'$:

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{v'}_0 &= \frac{\xi_e^3}{2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\left(3\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle\hat{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{v}\right) - \boldsymbol{v} + \frac{\dot{\xi}_e\xi_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2}\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\Big|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|=\xi_e}\\ &= \frac{3}{2}\left(\langle \boldsymbol{v}, \hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle\hat{\boldsymbol{n}} - \boldsymbol{v}\right) + \dot{\xi}_e\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\Big|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|=\xi_e},\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where in order to get the final expression we have evaluated the equation at the surface of the convective element $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| = \xi_e$ and simplified. It is simple to check that this equation yields correct results at the element surface, $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| = \xi_e$ once written in spherical coordinates (with θ the angle between $\hat{\boldsymbol{e}}_z$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$) so that for the radial component centred on O' we obtain $v'_{0,r} = -v\left(1 - \frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\right)\cos\theta + \frac{\dot{\xi}_e\xi_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2}$ by computing the Laplacian in spherical coordinates. It follows from this that $v'_{0,r} = \dot{\xi}_e$ at $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| = \xi_e$ because in S_1 the convective element does not move with respect to the fluid and the only residual velocity in the fluid is due to the expansion/contraction. In contrast, for the component $v'_{0,\theta} = v\left(1 + \frac{\xi_e^3}{2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\right)\sin\theta$, at $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| = \xi_e$ we get $v'_{0,\theta} = \frac{3}{2}v\sin\theta$ which is maximum at $\theta = \left\{\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{3\pi}{2}\right\}$. Moreover, for $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \to \infty$ we get $v'_{0,r} = -v\cos\theta$ and $v'_{0,\theta} = v\sin\theta$ so that at the stagnation point, $\theta = 0$, we obtain $v'_{0,r} = -v$ and $v'_{0,\theta} = 0$ as required by construction of the boundary conditions in the integration of Eq.(4): in S_1 the convective cell is at rest and the fluid flows along a direction opposite to the actual motion of the element in S_0. Finally, we compute the time derivative of the potential of Eq.(4) to be used in the sections below. At the surface of the convective element $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| = \xi_e$. The derivative is tedious

would represent an interesting field of investigation, these objects are not considered in the present study.

but straightforward, and after a little algebra, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\left.\frac{\partial\Phi'}{\partial t}\right|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|=\xi_e} &= -\langle\boldsymbol{A},\boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle\left(1+\frac{1}{2}\frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\right)+\langle\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{v}\rangle\,(1+\\ &- \frac{1}{2}\frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\Big)-\left\langle\boldsymbol{v},\frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}\right\rangle\left(\frac{5}{2}\frac{\xi_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2}\dot{\xi}_e-\right.\\ &- \left.\frac{3}{2}\left\langle\boldsymbol{v},\frac{\boldsymbol{\xi}}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}\right\rangle\frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\right)\\ &- \left.\frac{\xi_e}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}\left(\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e+2\dot{\xi}_e^2\right)\right|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|=\xi_e}\\ &= -\frac{3}{2}\xi_e\langle\boldsymbol{A},\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle-\frac{5}{2}\dot{\xi}_e\langle\boldsymbol{v},\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle-\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e-2\dot{\xi}_e^2, \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

where the relative acceleration of the two reference frames is indicated with $\boldsymbol{A}$. This quantity will be examined in detail in Section 6. The above analysis has given us two basic relationships, i.e. Eq.(5) and (6) that are needed to get the EoMs of the convective elements we are going to present and discuss below.

4 EQUATION FOR A CONVECTIVE ELEMENT IN S_1

The goal of this Section is to prove a relation connecting the evolution of the expansion rate of the convective element to the upward/downward motion inside the star. This important relation is obtained as a corollary of a more general theorem once two independent lemmas are considered.

Theorem: on the pressure-radius relation for expanding/contracting spheres in a non-inertial reference frame.

We want to prove the existence of a relation connecting the two generalized coordinates that describe our system: $\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$, the location of the convective element and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_e$, the size of the convective element. Being them mechanical independent variables, the relation we are seaching has to involve the physical quantities describing the environment in a given reference frame, that we choose to be S_1.

Instead of the classical approach reviewed in Section 1 proceeding from the Euler equation to the to Bernoulli's equation given by Eq.(3), we start from deriving the pressure acting on a convective element in the non-inertial reference system S_1 (defined in Section 3). This problem has been recently discussed by Pasetto et al. (2012) based on a previous approach presented by Pasetto & Chiosi (2009) (see their Section 3.1) extended to include a Navier-Stokes fluid-dynamics equation treatment. However, the simpler version of Pasetto et al. (2012) was developed for plasmas of much higher temperatures than the typical ones in the stellar interiors, i.e. for the hot coronal plasma of the Milky Way, and did not consider the temporal evolution of the inner border of the fluid[3]. The formalism developed by Pasetto et al. (2012) can be adapted to the case of convective elements as follows. The new velocity-potential Φ' and associated velocity are those already given in Eq.(4) and Eq.(5), respectively. We start using Eq.(7) of Pasetto et al. (2012) written with the notation here exploited, which is based on the same hypotheses made here (without the Young-Laplace treatment of the surface tension)

$$\frac{\partial\Phi'}{\partial t}+\frac{P}{\rho}+\frac{\|\boldsymbol{v'}_0\|^2}{2}=f(t)-\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}-\langle\boldsymbol{A},\boldsymbol{\xi}\rangle. \quad (7)$$

With the boundary condition for the hydrostatic equilibrium $\frac{P}{\rho}=-\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}$ of the star, in the limit of $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty$, it is easy to prove that we can fix the arbitrary function as $f(t)=\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty}\frac{\|\boldsymbol{v'}_0\|^2}{2}$. Using now Eq.(5) we obtain $\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty}\boldsymbol{v'}_0=\lim_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty}\frac{\xi_e^3}{2\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\left(3\langle\boldsymbol{v},\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}-\boldsymbol{v}\right)-\boldsymbol{v}=\boldsymbol{v}^{\infty}=-\boldsymbol{v}$ which means that

$$f(t)=\frac{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2}{2}. \quad (8)$$

Inserting Eq.(5) and Eq.(6) in Eq.(7), after some algebraic manipulations, we obtain the following equation:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\left\|\frac{3}{2}\left(\langle\boldsymbol{v},\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}-\boldsymbol{v}\right)+\dot{\xi}_e\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\right\|^2 &- \frac{\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2}{2}-\frac{5}{2}\dot{\xi}_e\langle\boldsymbol{v},\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle\\ +\left(\frac{P}{\rho}+\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\langle\boldsymbol{A},\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}\rangle &- \ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e-\frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2=0. \quad (9)\end{aligned}$$

To simplify this equation, it worth writing it in spherical coordinates. This is also motivated by the assumption of spherical symmetry made for the convective elements and the whole star (which retain their spherical shape during their existence). With the aid of this, at the surface of a convective element we can rapidly get to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\Phi'}{\partial t} &= -\frac{3}{2}A\xi_e\cos\phi-\frac{5}{2}\dot{\xi}_e v\cos\theta-\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e-2\dot{\xi}_e^2,\\ \frac{\|\boldsymbol{v'}_0\|^2}{2} &= \frac{1}{2}\left(\dot{\xi}_e^2+\frac{9}{4}v^2\sin^2\theta\right).\end{aligned}$$

Finally Eq.(9) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v^2}{2}\left(\frac{9}{4}\sin^2\theta-1\right) &- v\dot{\xi}_e\frac{5}{2}\cos\theta+\left(\frac{P}{\rho}+\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\right)=\\ +A\xi_e\left(\frac{3}{2}\cos\theta-\cos\phi\right) &+ \ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e+\frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2, \quad (10)\end{aligned}$$

where $A=\|\boldsymbol{A}\|$ is the norm of the acceleration, ϕ the angle between the direction of motion of the fluid as seen from S_1 and the acceleration direction, and θ has been already introduced before ($\theta\angle[\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\xi}]$). This is a rather complex PDE that links the fundamental quantities to which the generic convective element is subjected within the plasma inside the star. Nevertheless, despite its correctness, this equation is practically useless in this form because of its complexity: it is numerically solvable, but the lack of initial conditions to constrain the motion of the element does not allow us a complete coverage of the parameter space for the LHS (left-hand side) of Eq.(10). Nevertheless, it is the cornerstone of the new theory we are proposing. In order to get a deeper insight into its physical meaning we prove the following lemmas.

Lemma 1: on the velocity-space expansion factor. As a convective element expands during the upward mo-

[3] In S_1 a convective element can be identified either by an "external" surface delimiting its volume or the inner border of the external fluid containing the convective element itself. In this case we can speak also of an external border for the fluid, typically at $+\infty$ or far away from the convective element (e.g., Batchelor 2000).

tion, its surface acts as a piston compressing the surrounding medium and the perturbation propagates at the sound speed, v_s, throughout the latter (e.g., Landau & Lifshitz 1959). Under the approximations made for Eq.(1) and Eq.(3), i.e. excluding attenuation by shear, bulk or relaxation viscosity and heat conductivity, and limiting ourselves to the case of convective elements moving with velocities smaller than the sound speed, we get the following condition

$$\varepsilon \equiv \frac{v}{\dot{\xi}_e} \ll 1 \forall t > \hat{t}, \tag{11}$$

i.e. the relative velocity between the convective element and the intra-stellar medium $v = \|\boldsymbol{v}\|$ is much smaller than its expansion velocity $\dot{\xi}_e = \left\|\dot{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_{\boldsymbol{e}}\right\|$. This is a reasonable assumption for the stars and phases that we want to consider. Trans/supersonic motions of the convective cells, $v \sim v_s$, require a fully compressive model that is beyond the aims of the present paper. We will show in Section 7 that the theory developed under the approximation of Eq.(11) leads to correct predictions for the properties of the Sun. A simple, largely intuitive justification of Eq. (11) is provided by the following arguments: an ascending bubble must first contrast the gravity and push the surrounding medium, this second effect occurring at nearly constant gravity; therefore $v \ll \dot{\xi}_e$. In contrast, a descending bubble is accelerated by the gravity while being squeezed by the surrounding medium at nearly constant gravity and therefore its radius shrinks faster than the descending motion, also in this case $v \ll \dot{\xi}_e$.

The condition expressed by Eq. (11) allows us to simplify Eq.(9). Dividing both sides of Eq.(9) by $\dot{\xi}_e^2$ when $\dot{\xi}_e \neq 0$, i.e. formally when $\hat{t} \neq 0$, we can find a time $\hat{t}$ so that for $t > \hat{t} \neq 0$ we have $\left(\frac{v}{\dot{\xi}_e}\right)^2 \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{9}{4}\sin^2\theta - 1\right) \ll A\frac{\xi_e}{\dot{\xi}_e^2}\left(\frac{3}{2}\cos\theta - \cos\phi\right) + \frac{\ddot{\xi}_e \xi_e}{\dot{\xi}_e^2}$ and $\left(\frac{v\dot{\xi}_e}{\xi_e^2}\right)^2 \frac{5}{2}\cos\theta \ll A\frac{\xi_e}{\xi_e^2}\left(\frac{3}{2}\cos\theta - \cos\phi\right) + \frac{\ddot{\xi}_e \xi_e}{\xi_e^2}$ thus proving

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{P}{\rho} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}} &= \frac{A}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\frac{\xi_e^3}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^3}\cos\theta + \frac{\xi_e}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|}\left(\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e + 2\dot{\xi}_e^2\right) \\
&- \frac{1}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2\left(\frac{\xi_e^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|^2}\right)^2\Bigg|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|=\xi_e} \\
\frac{P}{\rho} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}} &= A\xi_e\left(\frac{3}{2}\cos\theta - \cos\phi\right) + \ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e + \frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where pressure, density and potential are evaluated at the convective element surface, and with $\hat{t}$ we do not refer to any "initial time" for the existence of a generic convective cell when $\dot{\xi}_e \sim v$, but rather to any time at which the Eq.(11) is fully satisfied. Initially the expansion rate is not necessarily faster than the bubble speed and the equation Eq.(11) is satisfied only asymptotically for t larger than a given $\hat{t}$ that can depend on the stellar properties. The acceleration term A has to be retained because the condition Eq.(11) relates our two Lagrangian variables by integration but its derivative, $\frac{A}{\dot{\xi}_e} - \frac{v\ddot{\xi}_e}{\dot{\xi}_e^2}$, does not represent a physical constraint: the correct relation between A and v and ξ_e will be worked out only in Eq.(64) in relation with the radiative and adiabatic gradients. This proves the Lemma 1. Moving now to a realistic situation: we consider the case in which a convective element moves radially upward throughout the external zones of a star and the acceleration and velocity are co-linear, and finally we exclude the possibility of convective overshooting that will be considered in a forthcoming paper (Pasetto et al. 2014). Since the mathematical simplification of Eq.(9) brought by Eq.(11) is of paramount importance, we must fully understand the physical implication and meaning of it.

This theory of convection is based on the assumption of non-local-equilibrium, i.e. we assume that the interstellar plasma on the surface of the expanding/contracting convective element while moving outward/inward slightly deviates from strict hydrostatic equilibrium. The condition of rigorous hydrostatic equilibrium is met by the star only at larger distances from the surface of a convective element, as required by Eq.(8), i.e. formally only in the limit $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\| \to \infty$. The physical interpretation of this limit can be understood as following. Eq.(11) has important physical implications on the path that the convective element is allowed to travel, i.e. the hypothesis expressed by Eq.(11), under which Eq.(12) is valid, indirectly excludes the possibility of long paths for convective elements: this is the main reason why in our theory the mean free path l_m and associated mixing-length parameter Λ_m do not intervene. This condition is already accounted by the physics implicit in Eq.(10) which is simplified by an expansion on a small parameter $\varepsilon \equiv \frac{v}{\dot{\xi}_e}$ to Eq. 12. With these considerations on Eq.(11), it is reasonable to assume that the *size of a convective element is always much smaller than the size of the star*, because if the path travelled by a convective element obeys $\|\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\| = \mathrm{O}(\xi_e)$ then surely $\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'} + \Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\| = \mathrm{O}(\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\| + \xi_e)$ by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. In this equation the centre of a convective element is $\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$ (i.e. the location of the origin of the system S_1, O'). In brief, we can assume that $\frac{\xi_e}{\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\|} \ll 1 \forall t > \hat{t}$, the collateral effect of which is to exclude the central zones of the star from our analysis. In this way, the property of hydrostatic equilibrium to which we refer by pushing to infinity the limit $\boldsymbol{x} \to \infty$ in Eq.(7) in order to fix Eq.(8), has the physical meaning of "far away" from the convective element surface, but still "close enough" to retain the density ρ as constant on global stellar scale. We refer to these mathematically asymptotic but local values for the pressure as P^∞, with $\rho = \rho^\infty$ and $\Phi = \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}^\infty$. The corresponding equation of hydrostatic equilibrium reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} P(\boldsymbol{\xi})}{\rho(\boldsymbol{\xi})}\right|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty} &= \boldsymbol{g}(\boldsymbol{\xi})|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty} \\
\left.\frac{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} P(\boldsymbol{\xi})}{\rho(\boldsymbol{\xi})}\right|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty} &= -\nabla\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}(\boldsymbol{\xi})|_{\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty} \\
\frac{P^\infty}{\rho^\infty} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}^\infty &= 0
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where the third equation holds by integration of the second at equilibrium (i.e. $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} = 0$) (see for instance Weiss et al. 2004; Kippenhahn et al. 2013)

If we consider now the unlikely situation in which the convective element moves outward travelling through the entire star preserving its identity till it reaches the outer layers of the star, in the co-moving reference S_1 the element surface expands until it reaches the equilibrium with the surrounding medium (note that this situation is also in strong contradiction with the standard formulation of the MLT). Thus the element reaches the kinetic limit opposite to that considered in Eq.(12) where $v \gg \dot{\xi}_e$, i.e. the element

surface does no longer expand and in S_1 is static equilibrium (or in S_0 the element rises with constant ξ_e). In this case, the element is able to travel long distances keeping its size unchanged (apart from an initial phase of oscillations at the surface not to be mistaken with the Brunt-Vaisala oscillations of the element position in the layers of a star stable against convection)[4]. This situation does not apply here because it is is ruled out by the conditions of Eq.(11).

Corollary 1: the asymptotic expansion equation for the convective element. When considering Eq.(13) it is simple to prove that the LHS of Eq.(12) cancels: $\frac{\rho}{P^\infty}\left(\frac{P}{\rho}+\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\right)=\frac{\rho}{P^\infty}\left(\frac{P+\rho\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}}{\rho}\right)=\frac{\rho}{P^\infty}\left(\frac{P-P^\infty}{\rho}\right)=\frac{P}{P^\infty}-1$ which goes to zero as $t>\hat{t}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|\to\infty$ because $P\to P^\infty$ independently from any angular dependence. We call $A^\infty = A\left(\mathbf{x}^\infty;t\right)$ the direction-dependent relative acceleration between S_1 and S_0 to the same limit where Eq.(11) holds. The behaviour of this term is complicated and requires a careful treatment for which we reserve all of Section 6. Leaving for the moment this term unspecified, from Eq.(12) we are left with the following equation that rules the asymptotic behaviour of the convective element evolution in S_1:

$$\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e+\frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2+\frac{A^\infty\xi_e}{2}=0, \tag{14}$$

that has to be solved and under our hypothesis gives the temporal evolution of a single convective element expansion. This is a difficult task achieved in the next section.

5 SOLUTION OF THE EQUATION FOR A CONVECTIVE ELEMENT IN S_1

As Eq. (14) governs the asymptotic evolution of any convective element, it is important to cast it in a dimensionless form and derive its most general solution. Even though Eq.(14) looks relatively simple, actually it is not, because of its high non-linearity. Indeed it contains two non-linear terms for the dependent variable, $\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e$ and $\frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2$, and must be coupled with another differential equation for the acceleration $\boldsymbol{A}^\infty=\boldsymbol{A}\left(\boldsymbol{x}^\infty;t\right)$ to form a system of two coupled PDEs. To cope with this difficulty, we start recasting Eq.(14) by means of dimensionless variables.

$$\chi\equiv\frac{\xi_e}{\xi_0}\quad\text{and}\quad\tau\equiv\frac{t}{t_0}\ , \tag{15}$$

so that for any given initial size ξ_0 of a convective element at the initial time $t=0$ in units of t_0 we have

$$\chi\left(0\right)=1\quad\text{and}\quad\frac{d\chi(0)}{d\tau}=0\ , \tag{16}$$

according to which we have assumed that a generic convective element of any arbitrary size, starts expanding with zero expansion velocity, i.e. obey the conditions $\chi\left(0\right)=1$ and $\frac{d\chi(0)}{d\tau}=0$. We remark that this choice for the initial conditions is arbitrary. As we are interested in the asymptotic behaviour of the solution (for $\tau\gg\hat{\tau}$), any other initial conditions, such as $\chi(\hat{\tau})=\chi_0$ and $\frac{d\chi(\hat{\tau})}{d\tau}>0$, would yield similar results. Therefore $\hat{\tau}$ can be chosen arbitrarily close to "0" and considered as a dimension-less parameter. With these assumptions we rewrite Eq.(14) as

$$\chi\frac{d^2\chi}{d\tau^2}+\frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{d\chi}{d\tau}\right)^2+\frac{A^\infty}{2}\frac{t_0^2}{\xi_0}\chi=0. \tag{17}$$

In this equation the normalized acceleration is a function of the time and position, the dependencies of which will be investigated in detail in Section 6 below. In the previous Section we have seen the relation between the condition Eq.(11) and the reduced spatial motion travelled by a convective element. To the same limit, we will rigorously prove in the next section that

$$A^\infty\left(\chi;\tau\right)\cong\text{const.} \tag{18}$$

to solve Eq.(17), deferring a rigorous proof of this assumption to a devoted corollary in the next section and by now to the solution of Eq.(17). At this point one could try to find a numerical solution of the equations as functions of time and space provided the temporal and spatial evolution of the acceleration is known. However, this way of proceeding would not improve significantly the theory of convection. This goal can be achieved by pushing the analytical analysis of the problem further. We proceed to put Eq.(17) in fully non-dimensional form by assuming

$$\frac{A^\infty}{2}\frac{t_0^2}{\xi_0}\equiv\frac{1}{2}\frac{A^\infty}{A_0^\infty}\equiv-2 \tag{19}$$

The reason for the last equality to -2 will become clear later on: it simply allows us to account for the fact that in S 1 the acceleration of the convective element is only due to the surface expansion and to the opposite motion of the intrastellar fluid on the surface of the convective element itself. The factor 2 is introduced for mathematical convenience. We proceed to get

$$\chi\frac{d^2\chi}{d\tau^2}+\frac{3}{2}\left(\frac{d\chi}{d\tau}\right)^2-2\chi=0. \tag{20}$$

which represents the goal of this Section. With this approximation, we are simplifying the system of two coupled PDEs, one for the expansion radius ξ_e and one for the position $\boldsymbol{A}^\infty=\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_{O'}$ of a convective element, to a new system of two coupled DEs: Eq.(20) and an equation for the acceleration to be developed Section 6 below. Despite its elegance, Eq.(20) is a *non-linear* DE, and so there are no general techniques available in the literature to solve it. Nevertheless, as the ODE Eq.(20) does not contain explicitly the independent variable, τ, a convenient change of variables is performed by introducing $\frac{d\chi}{d\tau}=\eta$. In our case we have $\frac{d^2\chi}{d\tau^2}=\frac{d\eta}{d\tau}=\frac{d\eta}{d\chi}\frac{d\chi}{d\tau}=\frac{d\eta}{d\chi}\eta$. Therefore, Eq.(20) becomes:

$$\chi\eta\frac{d\eta}{d\chi}+\frac{3}{2}\eta^2-2\chi=0, \tag{21}$$

which is a lower-order DE, the solution of which is simply:

$$\eta\left(\chi\right)=\pm\frac{\sqrt{c_1+\chi^4}}{\chi^{3/2}}. \tag{22}$$

Using the original variable $\frac{d\chi}{d\tau}=\eta$ and Eq.(16) we obtain

$$\frac{d\chi}{d\tau}=\pm\frac{\sqrt{\chi^4-1}}{\chi^{3/2}}, \tag{23}$$

[4] Note that in such a case it might be necessary to include the surface tension by means of the Young-Laplace equation that must be included in the EoM. This is not the limit of interest for us.

where the positive sign is for the expanding convective elements and the negative sign for the contracting ones. The solution of this equation exists for $\chi > 1$ strictly. In the case of an expanding convective element, a solution is always possible. By separating the variables, we get:

$$\int_1^X \frac{\chi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\chi^4-1}} d\chi = \int_0^T d\tau, \tag{24}$$

with $X = \frac{\xi_e(T)}{\xi_0}$, whose solution for the LHS is obtained by means of two changes of variable, first $y = \chi^4$ and then $z = \frac{y-1}{X^4-1}$. We must exclude the case $X = 1$ which means that the initial and final sizes are of the convective elements are equal. Therefore in all other cases $X \neq 1$, the solution is

$$\int_1^X \frac{\chi^{3/2}}{\sqrt{\chi^4-1}} d\chi = 2\left(X^4-1\right)^{1/2} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{3}{8}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{3}{2}; 1-X^4\right), \tag{25}$$

where we made use of the standard definition of the Hypergeometrical Function ${}_2F_1\left(a, b; c, z\right)$ (e.g., Lebedev 1972)

$${}_2F_1\left(a, b; c, z\right) = \frac{\Gamma\left(c\right)}{\Gamma\left(b\right)\Gamma\left(c-b\right)} \int_0^1 dt \frac{t^{b-1}(1-t)^{c-b-1}}{(1-zt)^a}. \tag{26}$$

The $\Gamma(c)$, $\Gamma(b)$ and $\Gamma(c-b)$ are the Euler Gamma functions whose values of interest for Eq.(25) are $\Gamma\left(1\right) = 1$, $\Gamma\left(3/2\right) = \sqrt{\pi}/2$, and $\Gamma\left(1/2\right) = \sqrt{\pi}$. This pretty elegant solution is particularly suitable for numerical implementations thanks to the large body of literature on the ${}_2F_1\left(a, b; c; x\right)$ functions. Most importantly, the intersection with the solution of the RHS (right-hand side) of Eq.(24) can be proven to be *bijective* thus representing an unique solution of the equation for a convective element in S_1. The solution obtained from Eq.(25) and Eq.(24) for unstable and stable convective regions is plotted in Fig.2. *We remind the reader that the solution is no longer valid for small or null values of τ, but only in the limit of very large τ and hence t, mathematically $t \to \infty$*, i.e. only when the condition for Eq.(11) is satisfied. Of course this does not represent a difficulty owing to the large possible freedom that we have on the time scale t_0 (say, seconds, days, to years over the timescale of the stellar existence, from Myr to Gyr).

The asymptotic solution of interest for Eq.(24) for $t \to \infty$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \chi\left(\tau\right) &= \frac{1}{8^2} \frac{\left(\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma\left(-1/8\right) - \Gamma\left(3/8\right)\tau\right)^2}{\Gamma(3/8)^2} + \mathrm{O}(\chi)^3 \\ &\simeq \frac{1}{8^2}\tau^2 - \frac{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma\left(-1/8\right)}{32\Gamma\left(3/8\right)}\tau + \frac{\pi\Gamma(-1/8)^2}{64\Gamma(3/8)^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Its asymptotic dependence is $\sim \tau^2$ plus lower order correction terms, i.e. quadratic in τ for $t \to \infty$ (see our cautionary remark made at the beginning of the analysis at the botton of Section 2). As a consequence of this, also the time averaged value $\bar{\chi}\left(\tau\right) = \frac{1}{\tau}\int_0^\tau \chi\left(\tau'\right) d\tau'$ will grow with the same temporal dependence. This is an extremely important result that will play a key role in the proof of the independence of the stellar convection from any free parameter (see Section 7.2 below). These results fully determine the relationship between the motion and the expansion (contraction) of a convective element.

Finally, it is easy to prove that once we are interested in the integration of a star in a phase of non-hydrostatic equilibrium, i.e. where $\frac{P^\infty}{\rho^\infty} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}^\infty \neq 0$, equation Eq.(12) is again integrated numerically with $\frac{P(\boldsymbol{x})}{\rho} + \Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right)$ being a known term valid everywhere in the stellar model. Thus, the solution to Eq.(12) can equally be recovered by simple translation of the solution for χ presented above, e.g. with a re-normalization to $\frac{P^\infty}{\rho^\infty} - \Phi_{\mathbf{g}}^\infty / A^\infty \equiv -2$ being A^∞ bounded in spherical coordinates $\left(\frac{3}{2}\cos\theta - \cos\phi\right) \in \left[-\frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2}\right]$. To illustrate the point, Fig. 2 shows the integration in the case of a layer with $\frac{P}{P^\infty} + 1 = 3$ (Pasetto et al. 2014, in preparation).



Figure 2. Integration of Eq.(24), for convection-unstable (χ, thick-red), time averaged ($\bar{\chi}\left(\tau\right)$, thick-blue) and stable layers (dashed grey). The red line is partially dashed to remind the reader that Eq.(24) holds only on its asymptotic expansion, say for $t > \hat{t}$ for an arbitrary chose $\hat{t} = 0.3t/t_0$ in the figure (see Section 5 for detailed discussion) with monotonic character evident from Eq.(27). The black semi-circle over $\{\chi, \tau\} = \{1.0, 0.0\}$ is excluded. With the black continuous line we present here for future reference (Pasetto et al. 2014) an integration for Eq.(12) in the case of convection in a star outside hydrostatic equilibrium (see text for details).

The next issue to address now is to prove a corollary on the acceleration in Eq.(18). This is the subject of the section below.

6 THE ACCELERATION

The PDE Eq.(10) or its approximated ODE Eq.(14) has to be supplied with a second ODE describing the motion of a convective element throughout the stellar medium. This yields a system of two equations with two unknowns, i.e. $\xi_e = \xi_e\left(t\right)$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_{O'} = \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\left(t\right)$. We present the detailed derivation of these equations from basic principles in order to explain the precise founding hypotheses of these equations. The considerations that lead to this result hold only in the context of the Theorem of Section 4 to which they are related through the following corollary:

Corollary 2: The acceleration of the convective element in S_1. The total force acting on a convective element in S_1 is determined by the total pressure acting on its surface $\boldsymbol{F}_P = -\int P\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}d\Omega$ and the weight $m_e\boldsymbol{g}$ of the element. The corresponding equation of motion derived from the Newtonian law $\boldsymbol{F} = m\boldsymbol{A} = m\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} = m\ddot{\boldsymbol{x}}_{O'}$ is the equation to be integrated together with Eq.(9). In the reference frame S_1 we can use the above force balance to express the

pressure force $\boldsymbol{F}_P$ and in turn relate it to the acceleration. We may write

$$\begin{aligned}
-\int P\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}d\Omega &= -\rho\int\left(\frac{v^2}{2}\left(1-\frac{9}{4}\sin^2\theta\right)+\frac{5}{2}v\dot{\xi}_e\cos\theta\right.\\
&+ \left.\frac{A\xi_e}{2}\cos\theta+\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e+\frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2-\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\right)\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}d\Omega\\
&= -\rho\int\left(\frac{v^2}{2}\left(1-\frac{9}{4}\sin^2\theta\right)+\frac{5}{2}v\dot{\xi}_e\cos\theta\right.\\
&+ \left.\frac{A\xi_e}{2}\cos\theta+\ddot{\xi}_e\xi_e+\frac{3}{2}\dot{\xi}_e^2-\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}\right)\mathcal{J}\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}d\Omega\\
&+ \rho\int\nabla\Phi_{\boldsymbol{g}}d^3\xi_e\\
&= -\frac{2}{3}\pi\xi_e^3\rho\boldsymbol{A}-\frac{10}{3}\pi\xi_e^2\rho\boldsymbol{v}\dot{\xi}_e+\frac{4}{3}\pi\xi_e^3\rho\boldsymbol{g}, \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

where the integral is carried out over the sphere representing the convective element at each instant on the differential form (the solid angle) $d\Omega$. θ is the angle already defined after Eq.(9), $\mathcal{J}$ is the Jacobian of the transformation from cartesian to spherical coordinates, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the unit vector of the position vector. Finally in the RHS, third line, simple trigonometric integrals have been computed and the Gauss theorem has been used to worked out explicitly the result. This equation accounts for the buoyancy of the convective element $\frac{4}{3}\pi\xi_e^3\rho\boldsymbol{g}$, the inertial term of the fluid displaced by the movement of the convective cell, i.e. the reaction mass $\frac{1}{2}\frac{4}{3}\pi\xi_e^3\rho\equiv\frac{M}{2}$, and a new extra term $-\frac{10}{3}\pi\xi_e^2\rho\boldsymbol{v}\dot{\xi}_e$ arising from the changing size of the convective element: the larger the convective element, the stronger the buoyancy effect and the larger is the velocity acquired by the convective element. These terms have to be included in the Newtonian EoM. Adding now the effect of the gravity on the convective element of mass m_e we get the general expression for the acceleration $\mathbf{A}$ in S_1

$$\boldsymbol{A}=-\boldsymbol{g}\frac{m_e-M}{m_e+\frac{M}{2}}-\frac{10}{3}\pi\xi_e^2\rho\boldsymbol{v}\dot{\xi}_e. \quad (29)$$

It is worth calling attention to the correction to the force balance that is required in order to properly include the inertia that a convective element experiences during its motion across the stellar fluid. More precisely, a convective element in motion experiences a drag force produced by the different density of the fluid it is moving through. In this way we naturally reconcile the correct physics with the D'Alambert paradox intrinsic to the velocity-potential theory approximation: if in Eq.(29) we change sign to recast it in S_0 instead of S_1 we recover standard results from fluid dynamics for the force balance, e.g., Eq.(6.8.20) of Batchelor (2000). Examining Eq.(29) we note that for $m_e=M$ we have $\boldsymbol{A}=0$ as indeed expected if there is no overdensity (no convection). For $m_e\ll M$ $\boldsymbol{A}\simeq-2\boldsymbol{g}$, which means that the convective element is reaching a limiting acceleration, i.e. the case excluded in the convection regime. For $m_e\gg M$ the fluid scarcely affects the initial acceleration of a convective element. This apparently means that the approximation in Eq.(18) does not hold, because the expansion rate of the bubble $\dot{\xi}_e\neq0$ as clearly assumed in the previous section and so apparently $A\neq0$. To show that this is not the case is simple by taking into account again Eq.(11).

A case of interest. As application of this corollary we look at the case of a convective element rising along the vertical direction in the reference frame S_0 with $\boldsymbol{g}=\{0,0,-g\}$ and $g>0$, and considering the same approximation used for Eq.(11) we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
m_eA_z &= -\frac{2}{3}\pi\xi_e^3\rho A_z-\frac{10}{3}\pi\xi_e^2\rho v\dot{\xi}_e-\frac{4}{3}\pi\xi_e^3\rho g+m_eg\Leftrightarrow\\
A_z &= g\frac{m_e-M}{m_e+\frac{M}{2}}-\frac{10}{3}\pi\xi_e^2\rho v\dot{\xi}_e\\
&\cong g\frac{m_e-M}{m_e+\frac{M}{2}}, \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

where for $\dot{\xi}_e\neq0$ we divide and multiply by $\dot{\xi}_e^2$ as already done for Eq.(12) to eliminate the term $\frac{v\dot{\xi}_e}{\xi_e^2}$ and to formulate Eq.(30) as an asymptotic expansion of order $\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{A_z}{g}\right)$. This proves that at the same degree of approximation under which Eq.(17) holds also Eq.(18) holds as was left to prove. We see also that the convective element will rise when $m_e<M\Rightarrow m_e-M<0$, i.e. when A in S_1 is negative so that the sign adopted in Eq.(19) remains fully justified as originally adopted. Finally, the factor 2 is simply chosen for mathematical convenience.

The last step required to integrate the EoM for a convective element within a convective layer deals with the instability conditions.

Lemma 2: Linear response of the convective element to the stellar pressure gradients. We formulate the linear response of the convective element to an pressure gradient. This auxiliary lemma proves a self-standing result that once included in the previous corollary will allow us to mathematically close the set of equations and to conclude the theory. In other words, we need to express the acceleration term in Eq.(30) as a function of the fundamental logarithmic gradients introduced in Section 1. This step is indeed necessary due to the presence of the new term $m_e+\frac{M}{2}$ in the denominator of Eq.(30).

For a small displacement of the convective element, say $\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$ it is customary to write

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &= \rho|_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}+\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho|_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}+...\\
\rho_e &= \rho_e|_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}+\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho_e|_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}+..., \quad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

in which all terms of quadratic order in $\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$ and higher orders are neglected. The subscript 0 refers to the equilibrium position of the convective cell. Because the volume occupied by the convective element is the same displaced in the fluid, the relation Eq.(30) can be easily translated to an equivalent one in the density. In its numerator, assuming that $[\rho_e-\rho]_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}=0$, we get the standard approximation (e.g., Kippenhahn & Weigert 1994) to the first order $\rho_e-\rho\simeq[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho_e-\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho_e]_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$ for the displacement of a convective element. However, because of the terms at the denominator we get also the more complicated expression:

$$\rho_e+\frac{\rho}{2}\simeq\frac{3}{2}\rho|_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}+\left[\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho_e+\frac{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho}{2}\right]_{\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}\Delta\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}. \quad (32)$$

This equation requires the density gradients which do not appear naturally in the equations of stellar structure. Therefore, we express them as a function of temperature T with the help of the EoS. Now, we must recast the correspondent instability criteria starting from the EoS for a perfect fluid $\rho=\rho(P,T,\mu)$ (see Section 1) that in its differential form reads $\frac{d\rho}{\rho}=\alpha\frac{dP}{P}+\delta\frac{dT}{T}+\varphi\frac{d\mu}{\mu}$. Here

$\{\alpha,\delta,\varphi\} \equiv \left\{\frac{\partial \ln \rho}{\partial \ln P}, -\frac{\partial \ln \rho}{\partial \ln T}, \frac{\partial \ln \rho}{\partial \ln \mu}\right\}$ where the standard notation has been used. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho_e + \frac{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\rho}{2} &= \left[\frac{\rho\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P - \frac{\rho\delta}{T}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}T + \frac{\rho\varphi}{\mu}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mu\right]_e \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\rho\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P - \frac{\rho\delta}{T}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}T + \frac{\rho\varphi}{\mu}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mu\right), \quad (33)\end{aligned}$$

After some manipulation, remembering that the change of molecular weight μ, $d\mu = 0$ for the moving element, we are able to simplify the RHS of the previous one as

$$\begin{aligned}&= \rho_e\left[\frac{\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P\right]_e - \rho_e\left[\frac{\delta}{T}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}T\right]_e \\ &+ \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P - \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{\delta}{T}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}T + \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{\varphi}{\mu}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mu. \quad (34)\end{aligned}$$

We consider now the first and the third element in the previous equation. While in the case of the derivation of the Schwarzschild criteria the first two terms in the previous equation simplify because $P_e - P = 0$ in any adiabatic expansion, this is no more the case here. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_e\left[\frac{\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P\right]_e + \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P &\cong \rho\alpha\left(\frac{1}{P_e}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P_e + \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P\right) \\ &= \frac{\rho\alpha}{P}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}\right)\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P \\ &= \frac{3}{2}\frac{\rho\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P, \quad (35)\end{aligned}$$

that simplifies Eq.(34) as:

$$= \frac{3}{2}\frac{\rho\alpha}{P}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}P - \rho\left[\frac{\delta}{T}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}T\right]_e - \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{\delta}{T}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}T + \frac{\rho}{2}\frac{\varphi}{\mu}\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}}\mu. \quad (36)$$

Now, by introducing the pressure scale length, with $\boldsymbol{x} = \{0,0,z\}$, we can further expand the previous equation as:

$$\begin{aligned}&= \frac{\rho}{h_P}\frac{3\alpha}{2P}\left(-P\frac{dz}{dP}\right)\frac{dP}{dz} - \frac{\rho}{h_P}\left[\left(-P\frac{dz}{dP}\right)\frac{\delta}{T}\frac{dT}{dz}\right]_e \\ &- \frac{\rho}{h_P}\left(-P\frac{dz}{dP}\right)\frac{1}{2}\frac{\delta}{T}\frac{dT}{dz} + \frac{\rho}{h_P}\left(-P\frac{dz}{dP}\right)\frac{1}{2}\frac{\varphi}{\mu}\frac{d\mu}{dz}. \quad (37)\end{aligned}$$

If we introduce the logarithmic derivative to write this equation as a function of the standard temperature gradients:

$$\begin{aligned}&= -\frac{\rho}{h_P}\frac{3\alpha}{2} + \left[\delta\frac{d\ln T}{d\ln P}\right]_e + \frac{1}{2}\delta\frac{\rho}{h_P}\frac{d\ln T}{d\ln P} - \frac{\rho}{h_P}\frac{\varphi}{2}\frac{d\ln\mu}{d\ln P} \\ &= \frac{\rho\delta}{h_P}\left(-\frac{3\alpha}{2\delta} + \nabla_e + \frac{1}{2}\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu\right), \quad (38)\end{aligned}$$

and recalling that $\frac{\alpha}{\delta} = \frac{\partial \ln \rho/\partial \ln P}{-\left(\partial \ln \rho/\partial \ln T\right)} = -\frac{\partial \ln T}{\partial \ln P} = -\nabla$ we can write Eq.(33) after simple algebraic manipulation as:

$$\left.\frac{d\rho}{dz}\right|_e + \frac{1}{2}\frac{d\rho}{dz} = \frac{\rho\delta}{h_P}\left(\nabla_b + 2\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu\right).$$

This concludes the proof of this Lemma.

The straightforward application of the previous lemma results is the compute of the acceleration as a function of the fundamental logarithmic gradients. By considering the motion of the convective elements along the vertical direction z, once we introduce this term in Eq.(32) and we consider Eq.(30) after algebraic manipulation we obtain:

$$A_z \simeq g\frac{\nabla_e - \nabla + \frac{\varphi}{\delta}\nabla_\mu}{\frac{3h_P}{2\delta\Delta z} + \left(\nabla_e + 2\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu\right)}, \quad (39)$$

to the leading order on $\mathrm{O}\left(\frac{\Delta \boldsymbol{x}}{h_P}\right)$. It is interesting now to call attention on some aspects of the acceleration Eq.(39) with respect to the classical formulation in the literature.

(i) In regions of homogeneous chemical composition the acceleration reduces to

$$A_z \simeq g\frac{\nabla_e - \nabla}{\frac{3h_P}{2\delta\Delta z} + (\nabla_e + 2\nabla)}, \quad (40)$$

It is then immediately evident how this new instability criterion induces exactly the Schwarzschild instability zones ($\nabla_e - \nabla < 0$) as the denominator of Eq.(40) $\frac{3h_P}{2\delta\Delta z} + (\nabla_e + 2\nabla) > 0$ is always positive by definition! This is a very important result because it allows us to extend the Schwarzschild and/or Ledoux criteria for instability: even with the new criterion, the convective zones occur exactly in the same regions predicted by the Schwarzschild criterion.

(ii) The zones of chemical inhomogeneity should be treated according to the instability criterion given by Eq. (39). In any case, we point out that relation (39) is a second order Taylor expansion on the small parameter, $\varepsilon = \frac{2\delta\Delta z}{3h_P}$, which to the first order yields the classical results for the acceleration of a convective element $A_z = g\frac{2}{3}\frac{\delta}{h_P}\left(\nabla_e - \nabla + \frac{\varphi}{\delta}\nabla_\mu\right)\Delta z + \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{2\delta\Delta z}{3h_P}\right)^2$ corrected by the factor $\frac{2}{3}$ for the presence of the inertial mass with respect to classical results. Furthermore, it incorporates the Ledoux condition. Onset and effects of convection in presence of a gradient in molecular weight are highly debated subjects that are not addressed here (e.g., Kippenhahn & Weigert 1994; Maeder 2009).

In Section 7.2 we will prove that retaining the second order terms is the key action in order to get rid of the mixing length thanks to the relation of Eq.(10). By proving the corollary and the lemma, we have concluded the new theory. We apply now our theory of convection in stellar interiors to a few key tests to show its potential capability.

7 RESULTS OF THE THEORY

In this section, we present some results and predictions of our theory. We compute a few selected physical quantities of interests and we consider their temporal evolution in the integration of a stellar model (in our case, the Sun).

Before proceeding further, in the spirit of the cautionary remark made at the end of Section 2 we comment on the time-limits that we are going to consider. As already pointed out in Section 5, once the condition of instability to convection is matched at a certain location $\mathbf{x} + d\mathbf{x}$ inside the star, convective elements are born and initially their radius ξ_e and surface in turn do not necessarily expand faster than their vertical motion v, i.e. initially it is $\frac{v}{\xi_e} = O(1)$ as $t \to 0$. Therefore, as the condition of Eq.(11) cannot be satisfied, we must start our time integration from $t > t_{\min}$, as already shown in Fig. 2. Different argument apply to the upper temporal limit. Integrating the last row of Eq.(30) we see that $v \propto t$ as $t \to \infty$ (this is indeed also consistent with the spatial series expansion of Eq.(31) retained to the first order), but at the time $\chi \propto t^2$ and hence $\xi_e \propto t^2$ as $t \to \infty$ and finally $\dot{\xi}_e \propto t$ as $t \to \infty$. Therefore, the condition $\frac{v}{\xi_e} = O(1)$ as $t \to \infty$ cannot be satis-

fied as required by Eq.(11). To cope with this and maintain the standard notation $\lim_{t\to\infty} Q(t) = Q^{\infty}$ at the same time, we take a suitable time interval $t \in]t_{\min}, t_{\max}[$, where at $t_{\max}$ the convective elements still live in an ambient medium of constant intra-stellar density (see Eq.(31)) and acceleration (see Eq.(18) and (30)). This approach has some similarity with the Boussinesq and anelastic approximations commonly used in other branches of research such as planetary and atmospheric sciences, oceanography, and geo-dynamics (e.g., Glatzmaier 2013). The novelty here is that for the first time all this has been formulated in the comoving frame of reference S_1.

7.1 The convective flux: from the single element to the collective description

We consider an arbitrary but fixed surface S inside the star with infinitesimal element $d\boldsymbol{S} = \hat{\boldsymbol{n}} dS$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}$ is the outward normal to the surface under consideration (i.e. any ideal surface through which the convective elements are free to flow). We assume that the number of convective elements passing through $d\boldsymbol{S}$ at a given time is $n = f d^3\boldsymbol{x} d^3\boldsymbol{p}$ where $f = f(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{p}; t)$ is the unknown distribution function (DF) of the convective elements inside the star. Then for every scalar quantity of interest, say Q, the out/inward flux of Q is $\langle Qf\boldsymbol{V}, d\boldsymbol{S} dt d^3\boldsymbol{p}\rangle$. This represents the amount of Q transported through $d\boldsymbol{S}$ with a given momentum $\boldsymbol{p} \in [\boldsymbol{p}, \boldsymbol{p} + d^3\boldsymbol{p}]$ during the time interval dt (with $\boldsymbol{V} \equiv \frac{\boldsymbol{p}}{m_e}$). Therefore $\langle \overline{Q\boldsymbol{V}}, d\boldsymbol{S}\rangle dt = \frac{1}{n}\int_{\boldsymbol{p}^3} \langle Q\boldsymbol{V}, d\boldsymbol{S}\rangle f dt d^3\boldsymbol{p}$, where the over-bar indicates the average of the quantity, and the amount of Q transported by any convective element with any $\boldsymbol{p}$ through $d\boldsymbol{S}$ in dt is $n\langle \overline{Q\boldsymbol{V}}, d\boldsymbol{S}\rangle dt = \int_{\boldsymbol{p}^3} \langle Q\boldsymbol{V}, f d\boldsymbol{S}\rangle dt d^3\boldsymbol{p}$. It is natural to define the flux of Q, $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$, as the amount of Q per unit area and unit time[5]

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi} \equiv n\overline{Q\boldsymbol{V}}. \tag{41}$$

In order to calculate the *convective flux* we need to compute the amount of internal energy per unit area per unit time carried by the convective elements. In our previous approach we assumed that the convective elements move adiabatically. Recalling that by definition the specific heat at constant pressure c_P is the amount of heat required to increase the temperature of a convective element of unit mass by one degree, we set $c_P \equiv \frac{1}{m_e}\frac{dQ}{dT}$ where the pressure $P = $ const. and $m_e = 1$ and we overloaded the "Q" symbol of "quantity" defined above before with its meaning of "heat". Therefore,

$$\Delta Q \equiv m_e c_P \Delta T, \tag{42}$$

is the heat excess of a convective element of mass m_e over the surroundings. We must use c_P, rather than c_V, here since, in accordance with our assumption of pressure equilibrium, the heat exchange with the surrounding medium occurs at constant pressure at each level. Once it has moved from its initial position $\boldsymbol{x}_1$ with temperature $T_{e,1} = T_e(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ and ambient temperature $T_1 = T(\boldsymbol{x}_1)$ to a new position at distance $\boldsymbol{x}_2$ with temperature $T_{e,2} = T_e(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$ and ambient temperature $T_2 = T(\boldsymbol{x}_2)$, the heat stored in the element flows from this to the surrounding medium (or vice versa depending on the ratio between T_{e2} and T_2). The amount of heat flowing through $d\boldsymbol{S}$ in dt is written as $Q = c_P \Delta T \rho \langle \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}, d\boldsymbol{S} dt\rangle$ where $\rho\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}$ is the mass flux. Consequently, the convective flux (i.e. heat passing through the surface $d\boldsymbol{S}$ in dt) is

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\rm cnv} \equiv c_P \Delta T \rho \bar{\boldsymbol{V}}, \tag{43}$$

with $\bar{\boldsymbol{V}}$ the average velocity of the convective elements during the time interval dt as seen in S_0. Here, we see that even if there is no net mass flux, the heat is anyway transported. Indeed, this flux in S_0 can be written as the sum

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\rm cnv} &= n\overline{m_e c_P \Delta T \boldsymbol{V}} \\ &= \rho c_P \overline{\Delta T \boldsymbol{v}} + \rho c_P \overline{\Delta T \boldsymbol{v}_0},\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where $\boldsymbol{v} = \boldsymbol{V} - \boldsymbol{v}_0$ is the peculiar velocity of a convective element in Eq.(4). If the mean velocity is zero, i.e. if there is no outflow/inflow mass flux carrying the heat, the energy transport owing to the heat carried by the convective elements $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{\rm cnv} = \rho c_P \overline{\Delta T \boldsymbol{v}}$.

We can calculate a self-consistent expression for the velocity in S_1 from Eq.(9). If $v = 0$ the heat flux carried by each convective element is null (the convective element is supposed to be spherical) because the same stagnation point will exist in the diametrically opposite side of the convective element. Therefore, what contributes to the convective flux is not the velocity of the stagnation points, but the velocity of the whole convective element, i.e. the velocity of the barycentre. Starting from the general expression for the velocity of a fluid element impacting the surface of a convective element given by Eq.(9), to get the sole motion of the center of the convective element it is sufficient to set $\dot{\xi}_e = \ddot{\xi}_e = 0$. This means that neglecting the radial expansion/contraction, the convective element moves as a rigid body, therefore any points of its surface co-move with the stagnation points, i.e. $\theta = 0, \phi = 0$. Finally, the condition of quasi hydrostatic equilibrium applies, i.e. $(\frac{P}{\rho} + \Phi_g) \cong 0$. Eventually, the square of the velocity is (remember the definition of Eq.(19) as acceleration of the fluid as seen from S_1 onto the convective element surface)

$$\begin{aligned}v^2 &= -A\xi_e \\ &= \frac{\nabla - \nabla_e + \frac{\varphi}{\delta}\nabla_\mu}{\frac{3h_P}{2\delta\Delta z} + \left(\nabla_e + 2\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu\right)}\xi_e g,\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where we have used Eq.(39). From the previous equation we obtain:

$$\frac{3h_P}{2\delta v \Delta t}\frac{v^2}{\xi_e} + \left(\nabla_e + 2\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu\right)\frac{v^2}{\xi_e} = \left(\nabla - \nabla_e - \frac{\varphi}{\delta}\nabla_\mu\right) g, \tag{46}$$

which, once the limit $\epsilon = v/\dot{\xi}_e \longrightarrow 0$, see Eq.(11), i.e. at $t \to \infty$ behaves as

$$\frac{v^2}{\xi_e} = \frac{\nabla - \nabla_e - \frac{\varphi}{\delta}\nabla_\mu}{\nabla_e + 2\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu} g. \tag{47}$$

This is a remarkable result that at a first sight may look surprising: the dominant term of the acceleration (in the denominator) $\frac{3h_P}{2\delta v\Delta t} > \nabla_e + 2\nabla - \frac{\varphi}{2\delta}\nabla_\mu$ does not affect the

[5] A preliminary investigation suggests that the present formalism (see the relationship between χ and ξ of Fig. 2, the connection between the size scale ξ_0 and the acceleration A, and finally the relationship between a star's gravitational stratification and ξ_0) could suggest the shape of the DF, f. However, for the the sake of simplicity, we prefer to adopt here the classical definition of convective flux based on the average velocity of convective elements. We defer a Monte Carlo approach to future studies of the DF.

velocity at the regime in which we are going to integrate our solution of the Navier-Stokes equation, see Eq.(10).

This counter-intuitive result is mathematically consistent only asymptotically in time and valid only within the approximation adopted in Eq.(11). It will be numerically checked in the next section (see Fig.5) where we will see that the ratio of the two terms of the LHS of Eq.(44) shows a maximum not yet investigated in the literature. It means that the mechanical evolution of a convective element (for instance its expansion) is dominated more by the local gradients of temperature over the pressure and less by its location inside the star $\boldsymbol{x_e}$. What we may learn from the above analysis is that the transfer of energy by convection is governed more by the expansion of the convective cells than by their upward/downward motions. It follows from this, that the properties of convection are mainly driven by local rather than large scale physics. This lends support to the hypotheses already implicit in the MLT. However, we remark that the above locality does not contradict the spatial changing of temperature gradients (∇, ∇_e etc.) and gravitational force across the star.

Finally, recalling that $\Delta T = \frac{T}{h_P}\left(\nabla - \nabla_e\right) v\Delta t$ (e.g., Eq. (6.19) Kippenhahn et al. 2013), we can define the convective flux along the radial direction as [6]

$$\varphi_{\rm cnv} = \frac{1}{2} c_P \rho T \left(\nabla - \nabla_e\right) \frac{\overline{v}^2 \Delta t}{h_P}, \tag{48}$$

where the factor 1/2 comes from the fact that at each level approximately one-half of the matter is rising and one-half is descending (Weiss et al. 2004) to secure mass conservation locally. Finally, recalling that the fluid acceleration in S_0 is seen a negative quantity, we can also write the flux as $\varphi_{\rm cnv} \propto c_P \rho T \left(\nabla_e - \nabla\right) \sqrt{A\xi_e} \frac{\Delta \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}{2h_P}$, we see that this equation is equivalent to the standard formalism, e.g. Eq.(7.7) of Kippenhahn & Weigert (1994), if we use the velocity derived from their heuristic considerations because the term $\left(A\xi_e\right)^{1/2}$ takes the dimension of a distance $[D]$ over a velocity $\frac{[D]}{[T]}$; indeed $\left[\left(A\xi_e\right)^{1/2}\right] = \left(\frac{[D]}{[T]^2}\,[D]\right)^{1/2} = \frac{[D]}{[T]}$ as required by the dimensional analysis.

7.2 The basic equations of stellar convection without the mixing length parameter

The ultimate result we are seeking is a self-consistent solution of the equations for the convective transport of energy inside a convective layer, without making use of adjustable parameters such as the mixing-length Λ_m. For simplicity we present here the case of a chemically homogeneous medium $\nabla_\mu = 0$, the major role of the convection is indeed to homogenize gradients of chemical composition. The general case $\nabla_\mu\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right) \neq 0$ comes then trivially with a suitable change of variables as more evident a posteriori. The key result, and ultimately one of the goals of this paper is the proof of the following statement:

[6] This is derived from Eq.(45) using the this formalism and recalling the fundamental theorem of calculus for a Lipschitzian function, according to which $\Delta \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}$ differs from $\boldsymbol{v}\Delta t$ by the quadratic terms $\mathrm{O}(\Delta t)^2$, i.e. beyond the approximation made in the Schwarzschild-Ledoux criteron or Eq.(40).

Theorem of the uniqueness of the stellar convection. *The radiative $\nabla_{\rm rad}$, the adiabatic $\nabla_{\rm ad}$, the local gradient of the star ∇, and the convective element gradient ∇_e are in a one-to-one correspondence (a bijection) with the body of variables (temperature, pressure, density, etc..) defining the physical state of stellar interiors.*

To prove the assertion of this theorem we need to solve the equation of stellar convection without any free parameter (e.g., the mixing length Λ_m) thus univocally assigning to each star its own characteristic convection. In other words, we are going to describe the stellar convection *not as a one-parameter family of solutions* (i.e. the mixing-length parameter Λ_m to be fixed by external constraints) *but with a unique solution* of the system of equations governing stellar convection. We start by extending the present formalism to include a few fundamental theoretical tools. A convective cell of mass m_e, volume v_e and radius ξ_e, once it has acquired a positive excess of temperature $|\Delta T| = T\left(\nabla - \nabla_e\right)\frac{\Delta \boldsymbol{x}_{O'}}{h_P}$ with respect to its surroundings, radiates energy into the stellar medium with a flux $\varphi_{\rm rad} = \frac{4acT^3}{3\kappa\rho}\left|\nabla_{\hat{\boldsymbol{n}}} T\right|$ where $a = 7.5657 \times 10^{-16}\mathrm{Jm}^{-3}\mathrm{K}^{-4}$ is the radiation-density constant, κ the mean absorption coefficient, or opacity, and c the speed of light. The radiative loss per unit of time $\frac{dQ_{\rm loss}}{dt}$ from the convective element due to this radiative flux and its adiabatic expansion causes a temperature decrease, simply because from Eq.(42) $dQ_{\rm loss} = -m_e c_P dT \Rightarrow \dot{Q}_{\rm loss} = \rho_e v_e c_P \left\langle \nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} T, \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}\right\rangle$. We then relate the radiative loss $\frac{dQ_{\rm loss}}{dt} = \frac{8acT^3}{3\kappa\rho} T\left(\nabla - \nabla_e\right)\frac{|\Delta \boldsymbol{x}|}{h_P}\frac{S}{2\xi_e}$ to the temperature gradient $||\nabla_{\boldsymbol{x}} T|| = -\frac{1}{\rho V c_P v}\frac{dQ_{\rm loss}}{dt}$ using the formalism of Section 4 by recalling that $\frac{\Sigma}{2V\xi_e} = \frac{3}{2\xi_e^2}$ to obtain the relation

$$\frac{\nabla_e - \nabla_{\rm ad}}{\nabla - \nabla_e} = \frac{4acT^3}{\kappa\rho^2 c_P}\frac{\Delta t}{\xi_e^2}, \tag{49}$$

which represents another equation to solve together with those we have developed.

Furthermore, in addition to the convective flux one should consider the flux carried by radiation and conduction. The radiative flux is ubiquitous and no other comments are necessary. Suffice to recall here that it depends on the temperature gradient existing in the stellar medium and the so-called Rosseland mean opacity. Conduction has an important role in the degenerate cores of red giants and advanced stages of intermediate-mass and massive stars, and dominates in the isothermal cores of white dwarfs and neutron stars. The conductive flux can be expressed by the same relation for the radiative flux provided the opacity is suitably redefined. In the following we will limit ourselves to the case of normal (main sequence) stars and therefore leave conduction aside. However to consider the possibility of including the conductive flux. We indicate with $\varphi_{\rm rad|cnd}$ either the radiative flux alone or the radiative and conductive fluxes lumped together with the mean opacity κ suitably redefined (see Kippenhahn et al. 2013, for all details). Therefore, in our simplified situation, the total flux is the sum of the radiative and convective terms $\varphi_{\rm rad} + \varphi_{\rm cnv}$.

We define now the gradient $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ that would be neces-

sary to transport the *total* flux by radiation alone as:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\rm rad}+\varphi_{\rm cnv} &= \frac{4acG}{3}\frac{T^4 m}{\kappa p\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\|^2}\nabla_{\rm rad}\\ &= \frac{4ac}{3}\frac{T^4}{\kappa h_P \rho}\nabla_{\rm rad}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Denoting with ∇ the ambient gradient in presence of radiation and convection the amount of energy carried by the sole radiation (or radiation + conduction) is

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\rm rad|cnd} &= \frac{4acG}{3}\frac{T^4 m}{\kappa P\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\|^2}\nabla\\ &= \frac{4ac}{3}\frac{T^4}{\kappa h_P \rho}\nabla, \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

We recollect here the system of six equations Eqs. (51), (50), (49), (48), (47), and (19) of the six unknowns $\left\{\varphi_{\rm rad|cnd}, \varphi_{\rm cnv}, v, \nabla_e, \nabla, \xi_e\right\}$ that we solve as a function of position inside the star $\boldsymbol{x}$ and for $t\to\infty$, once the quantities $\{P,T,\rho,l,m,c_P,\nabla_{\rm ad},\nabla_{\rm rad},g\}$ or $\{P,T,\rho,l,m,c_P,\nabla_{\rm ad},\nabla_{\rm rad},\nabla_\mu,g\}$ are locally known as function of $\boldsymbol{x}$. In the case of a chemically homogeneous layer unstable to convection, the system of equations for $t\to\infty$ is[7]:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} \varphi_{\rm rad|cnd} &=& \frac{4acG}{3}\frac{T^4 m}{\kappa P\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\|^2}\nabla\\ \varphi_{\rm rad|cnd}+\varphi_{\rm cnv} &=& \frac{4acG}{3}\frac{T^4 m}{\kappa P\|\boldsymbol{x}_{O'}\|^2}\nabla_{\rm rad}\\ \frac{\bar v^2}{\xi_e} &=& \frac{(\nabla-\nabla_e)}{(\nabla_e+2\nabla)}g\\ \varphi_{\rm cnv} &=& \frac{1}{2}\rho c_p T\left(\nabla-\nabla_e\right)\frac{\bar v^2 t_0\tau}{h_p}\\ \frac{\nabla_b e-\nabla_{\rm ad}}{\nabla-\nabla_e} &=& \frac{4acT^3}{\kappa\rho^2 c_p}\frac{t_0\tau}{\xi_e^2}\\ \bar\xi_e &=& \left(\frac{t_0}{2}\right)^2\frac{\nabla-\nabla_b}{\nabla_b+2\nabla}g\bar\chi\left(\tau\right)\end{array}\right. \quad (52)$$

where the last equation is the convective element equation studied in Section 5, time averaged (see Eq.(19) and Eq.(15) and Section 7.1). To prove the theorem we need to show that the asymptotic behaviour of this system of equations is time independent, i.e. we do not need to introduce any temporal time-scale (or any arbitrary spatial scale l_m as required by the MLT), i.e. the solution of the system is a unique manifold. This will induce an asymptotic behaviour in the numerical solution of the system, which will be presented in the Section 7.3.

The solution of this set of algebraic equations leads to a manifold that determines the gradients we are looking for, i.e. ∇_e and ∇. We proceed as follows. We substitute the first equation into the second one to reduce the number of equations from six to five. We then substitute its result into the third equation thus obtaining a set of four equations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} \varphi_{\rm cnv} &=& \frac{4acT^4}{3\kappa h_P\rho}\left(\nabla_{\rm rad}-\nabla\right)\\ \varphi_{\rm cnv}\left(\nabla_e+2\nabla\right) &=& \frac{\rho c_P T\tau_g}{h_P}\xi_e(\nabla-\nabla_e)^2\\ \frac{\nabla_e-\nabla_{\rm ad}}{\nabla-\nabla_e} &=& \frac{4acT^3}{\kappa\rho^2 c_P}\frac{\tau}{\xi_e^2}\\ \bar\xi_e &=& \frac{g}{4}\frac{\nabla-\nabla_e}{\nabla_e+2\nabla}\bar\chi.\end{array}\right. \quad (53)$$

[7] Since we are interested only in the asymptotic behaviour of the system we can already insert Eq.(40) with its asymptotic behaviour, see the remarks on Eq.(40) and Eq.(47) for chemical homogeneous layers. However, when performing the numerical integration presented in Section 7.3, all terms will be included.

Inserting now the first equation into the second one and defining two auxiliary quantities depending only on the local properties of the star

$$k\equiv\frac{acT^3}{\kappa\rho^2 c_P} \qquad \text{and} \qquad g_4\equiv\frac{g}{4}\ , \quad (54)$$

we get:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} \frac{(\nabla-\nabla_e)^2}{(\nabla_e+2\nabla)(\nabla_{\rm rad}-\nabla)}\bar\xi_e &=& \frac{k}{3\tau g_4}\\ \frac{\nabla_e-\nabla_{\rm ad}}{\nabla-\nabla_e}\bar\xi_e^2 &=& \tau k\\ \frac{\nabla_e+2\nabla}{\nabla-\nabla_e}\bar\xi_e &=& g_4\bar\chi.\end{array}\right. \quad (55)$$

Furthermore, taking the ratio of the first to the third equation and the ratio of second equation to the square of the third one, after some algebraic manipulations we get:

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} \frac{(\nabla-\nabla_e)^3}{(\nabla_e+2\nabla)^2(\nabla_{\rm rad}-\nabla)} &=& \frac{1}{3\tau}\frac{k}{g_4^2\chi}\\ \frac{(\nabla_e-\nabla_{\rm ad})(\nabla-\nabla_e)}{(\nabla_e+2\nabla)^2} &=& \frac{\tau}{\chi}\frac{k}{g_4^2\bar\chi}.\end{array}\right. \quad (56)$$

For each layer inside the convectively unstable region, we define a few auxiliary variables:

$$W\equiv\nabla_{\rm rad}-\nabla_{\rm ad}>0, \quad (57)$$

and

$$\eta\equiv\nabla-\nabla_{\rm ad}, \quad (58)$$

$$Y\equiv\nabla-\nabla_e. \quad (59)$$

Using these expressions we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\rm rad}-\nabla &= W-\eta\\ \nabla_e-\nabla_{\rm ad} &= \eta-Y\\ \nabla_e+2\nabla &= -Y+3\left(\eta+\nabla_{\rm ad}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

Finally Eq.(56) yields the most important relation and result of our study. We get

$$\frac{Y^2}{(W-\eta)(\eta-Y)}=\frac{1}{3}\frac{\bar\chi}{\tau^2}. \quad (61)$$

which we need to solve for $\tau\to\infty$. But recalling Eq.(27), the asymptotic temporal dependence of this relation (RHS $\to$ const. for $\tau\to\infty$) shows that convection inside stars *does not depend on time evolution and/or any spatial scale parameter, to first order* (i.e. it is independent from any the mixing-length/mixing-time):

$$\frac{Y^2}{(W-\eta)(\eta-Y)}=\text{const.} \quad (62)$$

This equation in the space of W, η and Y describes a surface containing the manifold of all possible solutions. This manifold is graphically represented in Fig. 3, where W, η and Y are replaced by their definitions: Eq.(57), (58) and (59) and the RHS constant have been evaluated at some arbitrary layer inside the convective region. It his worth recalling here that of the four temperature gradients that are involved, i.e. $\nabla_{\rm rad}$, $\nabla_{\rm ad}$, ∇_e, ∇, the adiabatic gradient $\nabla_{\rm ad}$ is always known given the thermodynamical state of the medium, and the radiative gradient $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ is known once the total flux is specified (this is the typical case of convection in the outer layers, where the MLT and/or the present theory are best suited). We are left with the unknown gradients ∇_e and ∇. It goes without saying that the constant at RHS of Eq. (62), $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ and $\nabla_{\rm ad}$ depend on the position inside the star, so that each layer has its own values for ∇_e and ∇ (Q.E.D.).



Figure 3. The manifold represent the surface of all the possible solution for the convection equation. Surfaces of constant W, η and Y are plotted but labelled with their corresponding definitions: W in yellow, η in orange and Y in blue. The purple manifold solution is computed for all the numerical values of interest for stars on the left-side of the Hayashi-line in the HR-diagram.

Finally, in the case of a chemically non homogeneous medium, $\nabla_\mu \neq 0$, after changing the definition of Y in Eq. (59) to

$$Y \equiv \nabla - \nabla_e + \frac{\varphi}{\delta}\nabla_\mu, \tag{63}$$

we obtain a solution manifold in the form of Eq.(62) (but with a different constant). Thus, an analogous theorem holds in the case of a chemically non-homogeneous convectively-unstable layer, which represents the mathematical proof of the recent finding in numerical investigations by Tanner et al. (2013).

7.3 Numerical solution: comparing the new theory with the classical MLT

The previous theorem immediately suggests a time-independent behaviour for the functions that are solutions of our system of equations for stellar convection. Thus, we expect a numerical integration of the system of equations

$$\left\{\begin{array}{rcl} \varphi_{\rm rad|cnd} & = & \frac{4ac}{3}\frac{T^4}{\kappa h_P \rho}\nabla \\ \varphi_{\rm rad|cnd}+\varphi_{\rm cnv} & = & \frac{4ac}{3}\frac{T^4}{\kappa h_P \rho}\nabla_{\rm rad} \\ \frac{\bar{v}^2}{\xi_e} & = & \frac{\nabla-\nabla_e}{\frac{3h_P}{2\delta\bar{v}\tau}+\nabla_e+2\nabla}g \\ \varphi_{\rm cnv} & = & \frac{1}{2}\rho c_P T\left(\nabla-\nabla_e\right)\frac{\bar{v}^2\tau}{h_P} \\ \frac{\nabla_e-\nabla_{\rm ad}}{\nabla-\nabla_e} & = & \frac{4acT^3}{\kappa\rho^2 c_P}\frac{\tau}{\xi_e^2} \\ \bar{\xi}_e & = & \frac{\nabla-\nabla_e}{\frac{3h_P}{2\delta\bar{v}\tau}+\nabla_e+2\nabla}g\bar{\chi}\left(\tau\right). \end{array}\right. \tag{64}$$

to present an asymptotic behaviour in time for at least some of the function solutions. In Eq. (64) the last equation is obtained from Eq.(47) with $\nabla_\mu = 0$ and the help of Eq. (15). Note that in the third and sixth equation of the system, the term $(3h_p/2\delta\bar{v}\tau)$ is retained. Although an and algebraic solution of this system (containing 6 equations and 6 unknowns as function of the time) can be worked out with an algebraic manipulator, it is exceptionally long and does not add a better comprehension of the physics we are investigating. For this reason, we present here a numerical investigation that enlightens the features of the system we presented and deferring to a future study the investigation of the complete ADE system (Pasetto et al. 2014).

At the same time, this will prove that we obtain correct numerical values for the gradients studied and that we can directly compare our results with the standard ones of the literature based on complete stellar models calculated with any of the sophisticated codes of stellar structure in the literature, e.g. the classical Göttingen code developed by Hofmeister et al. (1964), the many versions of this developed over the years by the Padova group, e.g. Chiosi & Summa (1970) with semi-convection, Bressan et al. (1981) with ballistic convective overshoot from the core, Alongi et al. (1991) with envelope overshoot, Deng et al. (1996a,b); Salasnich et al. (1999) with turbulent diffusion, finally the many revision and improvements described in Bertelli et al. (1994, 1995, 2008); Bertelli & Nasi (2001); Bertelli et al. (2003, 2009), and the Garching version developed by Weiss & Schlattl (2008, GARSTEC).

Using the library of complete stellar models of Bertelli et al. (2009) for different values of the stellar mass and chemical composition, calculated with the standard MLT ($\Lambda_m = 1.64$), we select a typical model for the Sun on which we can test the new theory of convection in a very simple fashion while we leave an extended numerical investigation of different stellar models to a future study (Pasetto et al. 2014, in preparation). Indeed the Sun for which we have the most complete information (see, e.g., Bonaca et al. 2012, and references therein) is the best place to test the new theory of convection. The solar model provides the mass, luminosity, pressure, density, temperature, opacity, chemical composition and many other physical quantities across the Sun for which we have precise data on the total luminosity, effective temperature and radius in addition to surface abundances and a rather precise estimate of the age.

In particular the Sun's model provides us with $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ and $\nabla_{\rm ad}$ the two gradients that are needed to start the analysis and that do not depend on the convection theory in use. It is worth recalling here that $\nabla_{\rm ad}$ in presence of ionization, as it occurs in the external layers of a star, is a complicated function of EoS, temperature, density, degree of ionization, etc. that cannot be approximated by simple analytical expressions. It becomes a simple function of the Eos only when ionization is complete (Weiss et al. 2004). The model of the Sun we are using includes ionization and takes it into account when calculating $\nabla_{\rm ad}$.

Using this model we calculate ∇ and ∇_e, velocities etc. both according to the new formalism for convection and also to the standard MLT adopting for MLT the current estimate for Λ_m in the Sun, i.e. $\Lambda_m = 1.64$.

Given the gradients $\nabla_{\rm ad}$ and $\nabla_{\rm rad}$, together with the



Figure 4. Temporal dependence of the mean velocity of a convective element in the Sun at the layer $z = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$. Remarkably, the velocity reaches the asymptotic value within a rather short time scale (of the order of a month or so). The yellow bar shows the 5% region of the asymptotic value of the various quantities on display.



Figure 5. Q parameter for the model of the Sun in an arbitrary but fixed point in the Sun at the layer $z = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$. The plot has been normalized to the value of the maximum.

function $\bar{\chi}(\tau)$, in each layer in the external convective regions of the Sun, we solve the system (64) as a function of τ (i.e. time) and position to derive the gradients ∇ and ∇_e, the mean velocity $\bar{v}$, and the convective flux φ_{cnv}. Since the term $(3h_p/2\delta\bar{v}\tau)$ is retained, the system will relax to that of Eqs. (52) only after a certain time interval has elapsed. How long is the time interval necessary to reach the asymptotic behaviour? The best way of evaluating it is to plot the time dependence of the velocity, the temperature gradients ∇ and ∇_e, and the convective fluxes $\varphi_{\rm cnv}$, $\varphi_{\rm rad/cnd}$ (Fig. 4). In particular in Fig. 4 the yellow bar indicates when the asymptotic values are is reached within 5% of their limit value. These curves plotted refer to the layer $z = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$, i.e. a shell representative of the external convective region of the Sun. All the quantities of interest reach the asymptotic value on a time scale of one month or even shorter.

Note that with our theory the path travelled by the bubble is of course not defined, nor has it any physical meaning, being a theory developed in a system of reference S_1 where the bubble is at rest by definition. In S_1 the only dynamical variable is the expansion radius that has an asymptotic solution, i.e. mathematical limit for $\tau \to \infty$ of $\lim_{\tau\to\infty} \xi_e \cong 2.65 \times 10^6$m at $z = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$. This asymptotic size of the bubble present in our theory in contrast to the standard ML, is not chosen in advance but it is *self-consistently* determined by our theory as evident from Fig. 4. Finally, it might be of interest to estimate the typical lifetime t_* of a bubble by taking the ratio of the natural scale length h_p to typical expansion velocity of a convective cell $t_* \equiv \frac{h_P}{\dot{\xi}_e}$ that at $z = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$ is $t_* \sim 3.2$ hours.

Here we verify the assumption leading to our Eq.(46) with a direct numerical integration of this equation as a function of time, using the input physics of Sun model. If we define the ratio between the first and second term in the LHS of Eq.(46) computed with the average velocity of the convective elements:

$$\bar{Q}_\odot = \frac{\frac{3h_P}{\bar{v}\Delta t 2\delta}}{\nabla_e + 2\nabla}, \tag{65}$$

we have seen that the asymptotic behaviour expected as $t \to \infty$ requires this ratio to converge to zero and the same trend is expected for the averaged behaviour of the convective elements. What is not expected a priori from a simple asymptotic expansion is the maximum that we see in Fig.5. This maximum is the result of the opposite time dependence of the numerator and denominator: while the denominator progressively increases toward its asymptotic value as shown in Fig. 4, the numerator monotonically decreases with time.

In column (3) Table 1 we list the results we have obtained from the system of Eq.(64) limited to the layer we have selected ($z = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$). We remind the reader that any other convectively-unstable layer would have shown similar results. A numerical investigation of the consequences of the present theory and a complete upgrade of the stellar models in Bertelli et al. (2008, 2009) is deferred to the forthcoming paper Pasetto et al. (2014).

Now we compare our results with those obtained from the standard MLT of stellar convection represented by the system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \varphi_{\rm rad|cnd} &= \frac{4ac}{3}\frac{T^4}{\kappa h_P \rho}\nabla \\ \varphi_{\rm rad|cnd} + \varphi_{\rm cnv} &= \frac{4ac}{3}\frac{T^4}{\kappa h_P \rho}\nabla_{\rm rad} \\ v^2 &= g\delta\left(\nabla - \nabla_e\right)\frac{l_m^2}{8h_P} \\ \varphi_{\rm cnv} &= \rho c_P T\sqrt{g\delta}\frac{l_m^2}{4\sqrt{2}}h_P^{-3/2}(\nabla - \nabla_e)^{3/2} \\ \frac{\nabla_e - \nabla_{\rm ad}}{\nabla - \nabla_e} &= \frac{6acT^3}{\kappa\rho^2 c_P l_m v} \end{cases} \tag{66}$$

in which l_m contains the mixing length parameter Λ_m. The derivation and solution of this system of equations can be found in any classical textbook of stellar structure (e.g., Kippenhahn et al. 2013; Weiss et al. 2004). We limit ourselves to note that in this classical system we have five equations instead of six, see Eq.(52). If we adopt the same model of the Sun we have used before to solve the system Eq.(52) with the extra value of Λ_m tuned on the sun, we get the results presented in column (4) of Table 1. The results are practically coincident with those from the new theory.

The comparison between our theory and the standard MLT predictions can then be extended over the entire convective region inside the Sun. We define a normalized difference function as $\Delta\Xi\left(\boldsymbol{x}\right) \equiv \left|\frac{\Xi_{\rm MLT}(\boldsymbol{x}) - \Xi_{\rm new}(\boldsymbol{x})}{\Xi_{\rm new}(\boldsymbol{x})}\right|$ where $\Xi = \nabla, \nabla_e$, etc., i.e. for every function of interest we com-



Figure 6. Normalized difference function evaluated for ∇_e ($\Delta\nabla_e$, purple line) and ∇ ($\Delta\nabla$, green line). MLT values are computed assuming $\Lambda_m = 1.64$



Figure 7. Normalized difference function evaluated for convective ($\Delta\varphi_{\rm cnv}$, purple line) and radiative flux ($\Delta\varphi_{\rm rad}$, green line). Same Λ_m has been adopted as Fig.6

pute the difference of its values obtained with the standard MLT, $\Xi_{\rm MST}$, and our new approach $\Xi_{\rm new}$. The results are plotted in Fig.6 for $\Xi = \nabla$ and $\Xi = \nabla_e$ and in Fig.7 for $\Xi = \varphi_{\rm con}$ and $\Xi = \varphi_{\rm rad}$.

As it is evident from these figures, the normalized differences between the two theoretical predictions are of the order of $O(10^{-5})$ over all the stellar radii of interest. This result holds independently from the stellar model adopted.

Furthermore, by looking at Fig.8 we see that the conditions that form the foundation of our theory (Eq.(11)) are fully satisfied. The sound speed profile of our model, that is part of our Eq.(11), is shown in Fig.8. The result is closely consistent with the models available from the literature (e.g., Weiss et al. 2004) or computed from Bertelli et al. (2008).

The different velocities of the convective elements predicted by the two theories may have some implications on the extension and efficiency of convective overshooting: the subject will be investigated in a forthcoming paper (see Pasetto et al. 2014, in preparation). Moreover, the meaning of the time-scales also differs: As far as the lifetime of the typical convective element is concerned at a chosen stellar radius, we evaluate this for the MLT as customary with



Figure 8. Profile of the sound velocity in the adopted model of the Sun and limited to the outer layers.

Table 1. Numerical results at the layer $\boldsymbol{x}_{O'} = \frac{98}{100} R_\odot$ inside the Sun's model. The differences between our theory and MLT at any other arbitrary but fixed unstable convective layer are of the same order.

	Units	Eqs.(64)	Eqs.(64) with $\Lambda_m = 1.64$
$\varphi_{\rm rad\|cnd}$	erg s^{-1}	61.6629	61.7020
$\varphi_{\rm cnv}$	erg s^{-1} $\times 10^7$	6.42855	6.42854
h_P	m $\times 10^6$	2.13852	2.13852
$\nabla_{\rm rad}$		295187.	295187.
∇_e		0.28310	0.28310
∇		0.28315	0.28332
$\bar{v}$	m s^{-1}	184.042	208.913

$t_* = \frac{\Lambda_m h_P}{v} \sim 2.3$ days. A similar time scale can calculated also with the new theory (see the entries of Table 1).

Finally, it is worth remarking that from the mathematical point of view, the results do not depend from the particular stellar model we have examined. Indeed, it would suffice to assign reasonable values to the gradients $\nabla_{\rm rad}$ and $\nabla_{\rm ad}$ and all other quantities to verify that *both systems of equations, i.e. Eq.(58) or Eq.(52), would lead to the same solutions even though the equations are different in form and physical meaning.* This is confirmed by the entries of Table 1 and *differences functions* shown in Figs.6 and 7).

The results we have obtained come out in a simple and straightforward way. The physical foundations of the theory are simple and free of ad hoc assumptions. Equally, this is the case for the mathematical developments that are carried out to reach the final result.

8 CONCLUSION AND CRITICAL COMMENTS

It has taken almost one century to develop a theory for stellar convection and energy transport without the mixing length parameter. In this first study we have presented a new simple theory of stellar convection that does not contain adjustable parameters such as the mixing length: the whole solution (temperature gradients of the medium and convective elements, the distances travelled by typical elements,

their velocities and lifetimes, the convective flux etc.) are all determined by the physical conditions inside the stars. We consider this to be a significant advancement.

We have formulated the equations of fluid dynamics in the potential-flow approximation. A posteriori it is evident that this is advantageous, simply because for a body rapidly expanding from rest it is a good approximation every time the inertia forces are larger than the viscous ones (at least on a time-scale of the order of $\tau \sim \mathrm{O}\left(\frac{\Delta z}{\xi}\right)$). This justifies this approximation and the correct description of the mechanics of the convective elements that follows.

We summarise here the major features and the major achievements of our theory. The approach is based on the addition of an equation for the motion of the convective elements to the classical system of algebraic equations for the convective energy transport. The motion of a convective element is described by the vertical displacement of its barycenter and relative expansion (contraction) of its radius, and the inertial of the fluid mass displaced by the convective element is accounted for. Consequently the acceleration imparted to the convective elements in addition to the buoyancy force takes into account effects that in the standard MLT are neglected, i.e. the inertial term of the fluid displaced by the movement and expansion (contraction) of the convective cell, and an extra term arising from the changing size of the convective element (the larger the convective element the stronger is the buoyancy effect and the larger the acquired velocity and vice versa). This results in a new and more complicated term of the acceleration $\propto \frac{\nabla-\nabla_e}{\nabla+2\nabla} \propto \nabla - \nabla_e$, agreeing with the Schwarzschild criterion.

It is found that the best reference frame to describe the system is the one comoving with the element. Because of this choice we are able to significantly improve upon the classical formulation of the MLT. Our treatment of the fluid-dynamics governing the motion of the convective elements allows us to remove any preliminary assumptions about the size and path of the convective elements and these now arise as natural side products of our theory.

No external calibration of parameters is required: the solution of the equations governing stellar convection is unique, in the sense that it is fully determined by physical properties of the medium. This is best shown in our Fig.4 which represents the numerical and graphical visualization of the Theorem of uniqueness. The solution of the system we build up behaves asymptotically, so no mixing-length/time is required. It is required only to wait that amount of time for which, within a given layer, the solution becomes stable to the required precision (in our case the yellow strip of Fig.4.

The whole system of ADEs is further simplified to an algebraic system by decoupling the evolution of the generalized coordinates of the radius and position of a convective element. This result is achieved by means of a series of theorems, corollaries and lemmas that permit the analysis of the different mathematical and physical aspects of the problem, always retaining the necessary rigour to trace progress to the final result. The new theory applied to the external convection in the Sun has been proved to yield results (convective fluxes, temperature gradients ∇ and ∇_e, velocity and size of the convective elements) as good as those that are currently obtained with the standard MLT upon calibrating the mixing length parameter. The size and path of a convective element may in principle change with the position inside the convective region, the evolution of the star, i.e. the particular phase under consideration, and finally the star mass itself.

Before concluding, first we comment briefly on the reasons why this was necessary to develop the theory in the non-inertial reference frame S_1 co-moving with the convective element instead of the more natural frame S_0 co-moving with the star. The flow past a sphere is indeed a well-studied topic of fluid dynamics (too large to be reviewed here!) and recently the Lagrange formalism has become particularly suitable to address this kind of problem: see e.g. Tuteja et al. (2010, and references therein) for a recent review and discussion. Unfortunately, this approach does not yield Eq.(10) and Eq.(14), in the Theorem and companion Corollary discussed in Section 4. These equations allow us to derive the acceleration term in which the properties of the convection element are related to the depth inside the star. To compute the kinetic term of the energy we would require to evaluate the integral $T = \frac{1}{2}\rho \int \|\boldsymbol{v}_0\| \, d^3\boldsymbol{x}$ which for the potential flow of Eq.(4) turns out to diverge. This forces us to work at the limit condition $\lim_{\xi\to\infty} \boldsymbol{v}_0 = 0$ for Eq.(5) and with a suitable potential energy $E_P = E_P(z, R)$ in the two generalized coordinates z and R as defined above in S_0. The resulting Lagrange equations under the approximation of Eq.(11) reduce to a system of decoupled equations instead of Eq.(14) which in contrast retains the desired coupling between the generalized coordinates. At this point the only viable solution is to write a Lagrangian for the non-inertial system, but this is indeed what was derived in Pasetto & Chiosi (2009) (their section 3.1), which represents our starting point.

Second, we compare the new theory with recent statistical analyses of turbulent convection in stars by Mocák et al. (2014, and references therein). In brief, adopting the so-called Reynolds-Averaged Navier Stokes (RANS) framework in spherical geometry, developed by the authors over the years, Mocák et al. (2014) present results for convection occurring in the stellar interiors and evolutionary phases of typical stars. These works represent an ideal tool to set up numerical experiments of stellar convection (from 1D to 3D models). However an analytical approach provides an understanding of the process in a way that a numerical one does not. In a forthcoming study we will present an extended survey of the impact on stellar models and a direct integration of the ADE system composed by Eq.(52) with Eq.(14) to extend the present formalism and theory to the case of overshooting, where the path travelled by the convective element has to be specifically computed (Pasetto et al. 2014, in preparation).

9 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

SP thanks D. Crnojevic for her kind hospitality at the Royal Observatory of Edinburgh where part of this work has been worked out. CC and EKG acknowledge support by the Collaborative Research Center "The Milky Way System" (SFB 881) of the German Research Foundation (DFG) at Heidelberg University, particularly in the framework of sub-project A5 and in the SFB visitor program.

REFERENCES

Alongi M., Bertelli G., Bressan A., Chiosi C., 1991, 244, 95
Batchelor G. K., 2000, An Introduction to Fluid Dynamics
Bertelli G., Bressan A., Chiosi C., Fagotto F., Nasi E., 1994, 106, 275
Bertelli G., Bressan A., Chiosi C., Ng Y. K., Ortolani S., 1995, 301, 381
Bertelli G., Girardi L., Marigo P., Nasi E., 2008, 484, 815
Bertelli G., Nasi E., 2001, 121, 1013
Bertelli G., Nasi E., Girardi L., Chiosi C., Zoccali M., Gallart C., 2003, 125, 770
Bertelli G., Nasi E., Girardi L., Marigo P., 2009, 508, 355
Biermann L., 1951, 28, 304
Böhm-Vitense E., 1958, 46, 108
Bonaca A., Tanner J. D., Basu S., Chaplin W. J., Metcalfe T. S., et al. 2012, 755, L12
Bressan A., Fagotto F., Bertelli G., Chiosi C., 1993, 100, 647
Bressan A., Marigo P., Girardi L., Nanni A., Rubele S., 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Bressan A. G., Chiosi C., Bertelli G., 1981, 102, 25
Canuto V. M., 2011, 528, A76
Castellani V., Chieffi A., Tornambe A., Pulone L., 1985, 296, 204
Chandrasekhar S., 1961, Hydrodynamic and hydromagnetic stability
Chiosi C., Summa C., 1970, 8, 478
Claret A., 2007, 475, 1019
Cox J. P., Giuli R. T., 1968, Principles of stellar structure - Vol.1: Physical principles; Vol.2: Applications to stars. New York: Gordon and Breach
Deng L., Bressan A., Chiosi C., 1996a, 313, 145
Deng L., Bressan A., Chiosi C., 1996b, 313, 159
Deng L., Xiong D. R., 2008, 386, 1979
Glatzmaier G., 2013, Introduction to Modeling Convection in Planets and Stars. Princeton University Press
Gough D. O., 1969, 26, 448
Hofmeister E., Kippenhahn R., Weigert A., 1964, 59, 215
Kippenhahn R., Weigert A., 1994, Stellar Structure and Evolution
Kippenhahn R., Weigert A., Weiss A., 2013, Stellar Structure and Evolution
Landau L. D., Lifshitz E. M., 1959, Fluid mechanics
Landau L. D., Lifshitz E. M., 1966, Hydrodynamik
Lebedev N. N., 1972, Special Functions and Their Applications. Dover Publications, New York
Maeder A., 1975a, 40, 303
Maeder A., 1975b, 43, 61
Maeder A., 2009, Physics, Formation and Evolution of Rotating Stars
Mocák M., Meakin C., Viallet M., Arnett D., 2014, ArXiv e-prints
Nomoto K., Sugimoto D., Neo S., 1976, 39, L37
Pasetto S., Bertelli G., Grebel E. K., Chiosi C., Fujita Y., 2012, 542, A17
Pasetto S., Chiosi C., 2009, 499, 385
Pasetto S., Chiosi C., et al. 2014, p. to be submitted
Prandtl L., 1925, Math, Meth., 5, 136
Salasnich B., Bressan A., Chiosi C., 1999, 342, 131
Spiegel E. A., Veronis G., 1960, 131, 442
Tanner J. D., Basu S., Demarque P., 2013, 767, 78
Tuteja G. S., Khattar D., Chakraborty B. B., Bansal S., 2010, Int. J. Contemp. Math. Sciences, 5, 1065
Weiss A., Hillebrandt W., Thomas H.-C., Ritter H., 2004, Cox and Giuli's Principles of Stellar Structure
Weiss A., Schlattl H., 2008, 316, 99